

E

695

S24



Class E 695 _____

Book S 24 _____



/

CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES.

FIRST PART.

547
1887

BY A BERKSHIRE FARMER.

"

"The times are out of joint."
HAMLET.

LEE:
OFFICE OF THE VALLEY GLEANER,
BERKSHIRE CO., MASSACHUSETTS.
1884.

E 675
S 21

TO THE
FARMERS OF MASSACHUSETTS,
WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF PARTY,
THESE CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES
Are Respectfully Inscribed.

249500
18

3

CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES.

I.

WHITE PLUMES AND THE WHITE FEATHER.

It is not so much the white plume that the country has reason to fear at the present time as it is the white feather. The danger is that men will not act up to the standard of their convictions. The Republican party has a presidential candidate who is opposed by the strongest and most influential Republican journals, distinctly on the ground of his corrupt antecedents. It is patent that his nomination was engineered at Chicago by the money, the manipulation, and the hurrahs of the Star Route thieves, and receives its warmest support among the most audacious and unscrupulous gamblers of Wall Street. These men are all on the make. Birds of a feather flock together. When Mr. Blaine was so very sick and like to die at the outcome of the Mulligan matter, who imagined that enough life could ever be galvanized into him to make him a presidential candidate of the Republican party? But the thieves and the gamblers represent the strong idea in the Blaine canvass. "Put money in your purse?" No, "Put money in *our* purses."

Now what do the white-feather men say? "We are Republicans and we must support the Republican ticket, no matter who is the candidate." Why? The journals which made such a hullabaloo over General Butler as a bad man — can they show that Mr. Blaine is a better?

Party fidelity is a good thing, but honesty, truth, and patriotism are better things. What constitutes the merit of party fidelity? It is the merit of the objects the party desires to accomplish. When it became clear to political aspirants and

party leaders that a public sentiment against slavery had been developed that would sweep slavery away, Whigs, Democrats, and Free Soilers combined, under the name of the Republican party, and away slavery was swept. And shall the combination that destroyed slavery make men slaves to the notion that party fidelity requires them to work together to effect other objects in which they have no longer a common interest? The people are more interested in having an honest and pure administration than they possibly can be in the success of any set of party leaders. A man who votes from a view of party obligation for a man or a measure he disapproves requires some new emancipation act to make a freeman of him. He voluntarily submits to the basest kind of bondage.

It is not possible that the Republican farmers of Berkshire County will be wheeled into line, as a flock of sheep in the Highlands is driven by the trained dogs of the shepherd. The Star Route thieves have succeeded in capturing the Republican Convention, and their nominee is the nominee of Stephen B. Elkins, Kellogg, Brady, Price, Dorsey, Salisbury, and the gang whose object is to run the Republican party for the most money there is in it. The farmers are considering whether this can be the best thing for the country, and if they come to the conclusion that it is not, it will be hard to convince them that party fidelity is a sufficient excuse for the betrayal of the country. Our paramount duty is owing to the Republic, and not to the Republican party.

Hostility to slavery and the preservation of a slaveless union were the pivotal ideas of the Republican organization. Slavery is gone, and nothing turns on it now. The salvation of the Union is still an issue, and may Heaven save it from the hands of the Elkinses, the Goulds, the Dorseys, and the Blaines!

At another time I may have a word more to say to the great men of the Republican party. Meanwhile I would ask Governor Robinson what has become of the great moral stalking horse that he curveted on so gallantly last summer and autumn? Mr. Senator Dawes and Mr. Senator Hoar, what business have *you* in the ranks of the Star Route thieves? You are purists, and have a holy horror of Democratic iniquities. Since the defaulters of Jackson's time and Van Buren's there has never been such a gang as the Star Route thieves; and these men,

countenanced, protected, and saved from the penitentiary by Republican influence, manage to dictate the nominations of the Republican convention. The people rose against the party of the defaulters, and crushed them by the election of General Harrison. This party of the people is again in the field. They are the only third party we require to elect an honest man, if such a man should be offered for their suffrage.

June 30, 1884.

II.

OVER-TAXATION TYRANNY.

The Plumed Knight and the Surplus.

FROM the earliest times to the present, the great effort of the governing class in kingdoms, empires, and republics has been and is to squeeze all the money possible out of the people in the shape of taxes, direct and indirect, gifts, imposts, duties, assessments, capitations, grants, and stealings generally. Governing has always been a first-class business for smart men.

Excuses for taking the people's money vary from time to time. Sometimes it is for the defense of the realm and sometimes for aggressive war. Then come contracts for food and clothing, and munitions and arms and all sorts of military supplies, and thence "profits do acerue" to the governing class and their friends. The people in some shape pay the piper, and the managers and hangers-on of the government grow rich at the people's expense. Sometimes it is for building palaces, and for laying out gardens and terraces and bosquets, and fish-ponds and water-works. Louis XIV. and his ministers understood these processes in their day. The courtiers and contractors — the men who pocketed the money wrung from the people — assured the people that it was the best thing in the world for them to pay this money, — that it gave work and wages to the builders and artisans, and made the gold circulate. The people did not know but what it was best, they were told so with such confidence.

Few, comparatively, profited by these levies on the people. The men who collected the money, they feathered their nests.

The men who received the money helped themselves to what they thought was about a fair share, liberally estimated. The men who spent the money made their contracts judiciously, and never omitted to take their percentage. There was always a handsome margin for the governors. Then the favored contractor sub-let at a splendid profit, and another circle was let in who were interested in raising moneys from the people for the "support of the government." These rings all told embraced an inconsiderable number of persons, but they succeeded in convincing the people that it was good for them to be robbed and plundered, till from painful experience the people began to doubt it, till doubt became conviction, and one day they rose up and did a great deal of wild work with gallows and guillotine.

But what a high time it would have been for the Louises if they had been able for a series of years not only to raise all the money that they could spend, but a surplus of five hundred millions of francs that they did not know what to do with!

For our French friends this would have been a difficulty, but in our case the conundrum has been solved by Mr. James Gillespie Blaine. Raise from the people hundreds of millions of dollars, and when the pension agents and pensioners are satisfied, and we have paid the interest on our public debt and a large block of the principal, and have squandered millions more in local harbor and river bills with no rivers and no harbors behind them, and have built at the cost of untold millions all the post-offices and custom-houses that we can find sites for, and have glutted the appetite of the Star Route thieves, and have sunk millions by the hundred in fortifications that do not fortify, and on defensive navies that cannot defend, we will continue to raise a hundred million of dollars more than we can possibly spend, *and will distribute it among the States!*

That is Mr. Blaine's idea of what the people are good for, — to pay money that by some of the numerous channels to which I have alluded can come into the hands of the smart men who constitute the governing class. It is the old, old story. So the people were regarded by their rulers in Rome; so in France, so in England. Our rulers make a better thing of it for themselves and their friends than rulers have ever done before, and the created wealth which in its countless manipulations enables

the governing class to raise these immense surpluses and squander them with such reckless prodigality, comes from the men who till the soil, work the mines, and follow the sea. Labor does it all.

Thomas Jefferson told your fathers, farmers of Berkshire, and your fathers believed in him, that we required, to make us a happy and prosperous people, a "wise and *frugal* government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." "This," he added, "is the sum of good government." Therefore it was that he recommended "*economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened.*"

James Gillespie Blaine believes in a government that shall continue to levy on the people an excess over the reckless and boundless present expenditure of an hundred millions of dollars, *to be distributed among the States*. What wonder that the Star Route thieves and the men who want to become Star Route thieves rally round the Plumed Knight, who "couches his lance," as Senator Frye tells us, for this magnificent charge on the treasury and the people of the United States!

In a Berkshire weekly paper I have noticed a paragraph laudatory of an article in which Judge Robinson "explains" his determination to support Mr. Blaine for the presidency, and gives an "exhaustive and irresistible argument" in support of those Republican journals which, "saying they would ne'er consent, consented" to accept him as their candidate.

When I obtain a copy of the "model article," which shows the voters of Berkshire how a "fatal and irretrievable nomination" can evolve into a very desirable election, I will pay my respects to it. Meanwhile I would ask the Judge to "explain" if he referred to Mr. Blaine when he wrote "*no man of doubtful record and policy should be nominated.*" The context indicates that he could have referred to no one else. What did he intend by the words "doubtful record"? For if a man of "doubtful record" ought not to be nominated, one might well enough suppose that a man of "doubtful record" ought not to be supported by voters who honestly entertain this opinion.

July 7, 1884.

III.

THE FIGHT BETWEEN THE OFFICE-HOLDERS AND THE PEOPLE.

Blaine or Cleveland?

TWO party conventions have now met and presented their respective candidates for the presidential office. One convention was an exceedingly boisterous and turbulent assemblage of custom-house officers, postmasters, and boss politicians of the Republican party, who in a hurricane of shouts, yells, cat-calls, and tin-pan cymbals nominated Mr. James G. Blaine, and went into idiotic ecstasies over a helmet with a white plume paraded as the emblem of their candidate and the sign under which they hope to conquer the people. The master spirit of the convention, more efficient, perhaps, than any other man in producing the result, was the collector of customs from New York,—an office-holder with many hundred obedient subordinates, representing and inspired by the sentiment that the country belongs to the office-holders, and that its revenues are their legitimate and inalienable spoils.

For four-and-twenty years, all the offices of honor and profit in the United States have been substantially in the possession of the leaders and managers of the Republican party. No set of men has ever held possession of them for a longer period. The Democrats controlled them for twenty-four years, from the inauguration of Jefferson to the inauguration of John Quincy Adams. Then came an interregnum. Though a Democrat, Mr. Adams was not the nominee of the congressional caucus, and a new party was formed in his support. Four years the government was in the hands of National Republicans, and the legitimate succession was interrupted. Mr. Adams was not magnetic or a manipulator of men, and the power of the offices was wielded to a great extent by his opponents. Once again the Democratic party proper was reinstated in their possession. Eight years under General Jackson, and four years under Martin Van Buren, the office-holders ruled the country with a rod of iron. An hundred thousand strong, they managed the primary meetings, packed the conventions, nominated the candidates, dictated the policy of the government in their plat-

forms, and not contented with the lawful fees of their offices, in many hundreds of instances used the funds of the government as their own. Frauds and defalcations became the order of the day. The better portion of the Democratic party revolted against this corrupt domination. Under the lead of Rives of Virginia, Tallmadge of New York, and White and Bell of Tennessee, the revolt was made effective. The issue was distinctly taken between the people and the office-holders, and the people triumphed in the election of General Harrison. The struggle was a severe and doubtful one. The office-holders denounced the seceding Democrats as bolters and traitors, as they denounce the Independents now. And what they call "loyalty to the grand old party" meant just exactly what it means to-day, — loyalty to the office-holders, loyalty to the men who have sustained the corruptions of the Grant régime, the remunerating and grateful policy of Hayes, and the questionable because questioned record of Garfield!

The Republican convention that nominated Blaine was to all intents and purposes a convention of office-holders, in the same sense as was the convention that nominated Van Buren in 1839. No candidate stood the ghost of a chance in it except the two adroit politicians who could rally and manœuvre the forces of the post-office, the custom-house, and the departments. Arthur and Blaine held the convention from the start, and the result was a foregone conclusion. For ten years Mr. Blaine has enjoyed opportunities, and has availed himself of them, to organize and educate to his purposes the tremendous phalanx that makes a business of politics and lives on its emoluments. The men who set up for the "leadership," the men who claim to be the "organizing force" in the Republican party, the men who run the government for the money in it, have for years looked up to Mr. Blaine as their natural-born chief, and reams of Mulligan letters, each more disgraceful than the rest, could not shake their allegiance or impair their loyalty. President Arthur's experience has been a briefer and more local experience. His manipulation of ward primaries Mr. Blaine has extended over counties and states, and though Arthur nominally captured and apparently controlled for some purposes a considerable number of delegates to the convention, it was well understood among them that Blaine had the inside track, and that he was the most

authentic exponent of the Republican doctrines as they are understood by the office-holders and exhibited by the Star Route thieves.

Against the corrupt alliance of office-holders and jobbers in politics, the people have put their presidential candidate in nomination in the person of Grover Cleveland of New York. He is presented for our suffrages by the Democratic convention, in obedience to the irresistible pressure of public opinion. Opposed bitterly by the most trenchant and eccentric Democratic journal in the country and by the most powerful faction of the Democratic party in his own State, with statesmen and leaders of his party more distinguished than himself in competition for the nomination, the people have made in all quarters such an emphatic demand for his candidacy that it would have been madness for the Democratic convention to refuse to listen to it.

The story of Grover Cleveland is a short one. By his fellow-citizens he was placed in the mayoralty of Buffalo at a time when the municipal service was badly debauched, and the level head and the strong hand of a bold and honest reformer were required for the public protection. In this position he distinguished himself by the exhibition of the qualities that were demanded. The attention of his fellow-citizens throughout the State was directed toward him. He seemed the very man that they wanted for the chair of the governor. He was placed in nomination by the Democratic party of which he was a member. The people of the State seconded the nomination, and he became the governor of New York by the largest majority ever given to a gubernatorial candidate. In this position he has more than maintained, he has largely added to, his reputation as a discreet, faithful, firm, intelligent, and honest public servant. He has been the tool of no clique, no ring, no faction, no party. He has had but one aim — his duty. He has known but one master — the people. And now the people rise in their strength, and with a general acclaim pronounce their judgment, "Thou hast been faithful over a few things, we will make thee ruler over many things!"

And why should the farmers of Berkshire turn their backs on him, whether they have called themselves Democrats or Republicans? The cry is raised of "loyalty to party!" What does that mean, practically, but loyalty to the office-holders?

The Republican party has accomplished its mission. It has saved the Union and destroyed slavery. Are we called upon to be loyal to the corruptions in the navy department, in the land offices, in the Indian bureau, in the post-office? Are we bound to go forever for things as they are, when we see the people robbed of hundreds of thousands by the Star Route thieves, and the Republican office-holders unwilling or incompetent to secure their punishment? When we see the Republican counsel for the people suggesting to their attorney-general that it might be well to consult with Mr. Chandler as to the political effect of putting a particular witness on the stand whose testimony might damage the Republican party? Justice may suffer, but the office-holders must be protected. Loyalty to the party, the whole length and breadth of which in the present position of the party with regard to its essential principles, I repeat, is loyalty to the office-holders! Shall we hear nothing of loyalty to the country? Of loyalty to truth, honor, and patriotism? Of loyalty to common sense and common honesty? Of loyalty to the principle that excessive and extravagant taxation is tyranny, and tyranny in its most odious shape, and that the great want of the nation now is a frugal and honest government that labor may be less heavily burdened?

Elected as the choice of the people, with the full knowledge that he never has been and never will be the slave of a faction, Grover Cleveland will give us such a government.

July 12, 1884.

IV.

THE OFFICE-HOLDERS' RATIFICATION.

Mr. Blaine's Argument for the Money Power. — Democratic Aggressiveness Sufficient.

IN my first chapter I promised to say a word more to Governor Robinson, Senator Hoar, and Senator Dawes; and I do not know that a more fitting opportunity will occur than is afforded by their appearance together at the meeting of the Republicans in Boston to ratify the presidential nominations of their not very recent convention at Chicago. In the same con-

nection I may redeem the promise of paying my respects to Judge Robinson and his political papers in the North Adams "Transcript." The speakers at the ratification meeting discussed the same topics and put forward similar arguments, with the view of demonstrating to the Republicans of the State that while Mr. Blaine ought not to have been nominated for the presidency, he ought to be elected.

In our happy country, considered as a Federal Union, we have two classes of office-holders. One class is elected by the people and the States, and the other class is appointed by the Executive, sometimes with and sometimes without the concurrence of the Senate, a body of office-holders elected by the States. In practice, the Executive has little or nothing to do with the selection of postmasters, custom-house officers, the officers in the judicial departments or the internal revenue service. They are appointed on the recommendation of the representative in Congress in the appointee's district, or of one or both of the U. S. senators from his State. Officers in the departments and the diplomatic service are appointed on similar recommendations. This immense body of men, occupying offices of honor or offices of profit, or offices both of honor and profit, constitute what is called the "organizing force" of the Republican party. What that means may be gathered from the make-up of the ratification meeting held a few days since in Boston.

The presiding officer, Mr. Lodge, is an important member of the "organizing force," being chairman of the Republican State Committee, and a Republican candidate for the U. S. House of Representatives. Then we have Mr. Dawes and Mr. Hoar, senators of the United States, Mr. Long, a member of the lower House, Governor Robinson, whose reelection demands loyalty to the "organizing force," an ex-collector of customs with a grateful recollection of the official flesh-pots, an ex-member of Congress, and a grocer in good standing to represent the business element as a desirable addition to the office-holding element of the meeting. So much for the platform. On the floor were the followers and henchmen, who were indebted to the "big Indians" on the platform for their places, and, as their chairman has phrased it in another connection, sneeze when their master takes snuff. These men, all of them, have an interest distinct from that of the people. They are so con-

nected with the organization that they must be loyal to it. There is no help for it. They are the organization, and must be loyal to themselves; and that is just what they mean when they call on the rank and file to be loyal to the party, and propose to shoot the deserters.

"Loyalty," his own loyalty to the convention of office-holders, — for as we see it in Massachusetts, so is it through the whole length and breadth of the country, from Maine to Louisiana and from Maryland to California, the "organization" in its present aspect is the result of office-holding affiliations, — this "loyalty" is the burden of Mr. Lodge's opening address. The only other point outside of the commonplaces of the stump is the philosophical reflection, born of Mr. Lodge's studies and experience, that parties cannot arise out of personal issues. The greatest party that ever flourished in this country was the Jackson party. It was his devoted personal following that elected General Jackson, and enabled him to impose his own policy upon the country, without regard to party platforms or traditions except so far as he saw fit to adopt them. General Jackson himself was the issue, and the only vital issue, at his first election as well as the second, and he might have changed his policy on vital questions without losing his ascendancy with the people. Personality will have a great deal to do with the present canvass. The people believe in the integrity, the firmness, and the patriotism of Grover Cleveland. They are consequently attracted by his personality: and in spite of the combination against him of office, money, and jobbery, the people will make him President. "With money we will get partisans, with partisans votes, and with votes money," is the maxim of the Dorseys and Bradys to-day, as it was said to be of the public pilferers fifty years ago.

"There are two parties," is the cry of Lodge, Robinson, Hoar, Dawes, and Long; "there are two parties," and you must fight it out on that platform, no matter who are the candidates. There are two parties, true, and there is a reserve force of the people, of the men who are not office-holders, and who do not want office, who owe allegiance to the Constitution and the country, and wear the collar of no sect or faction. They are not partisans, and are not to be fooled by the rant and fustian of any "organizing force" that office and jobbery may combine to shackle them with.

What a terrible falling off in the curveting gubernatorial candidate of the purists since last autumn, when he is obliged to culminate and cap-sheaf his ratifying speech with the Bob Acres cry of "We won't run!" And yet here it is: "Now we will not desert our posts because somebody may call us hard names, or because somebody may fling insinuations at the platform or the candidates." No! "We won't run!" Any man, seemingly, would be a simpleton to run from "hard names" or an "insinuation" only. But Governor Robinson does run away from the issue, and is afraid to meet the positive charges which he dismisses as "insinuations," and the well-deserved epithets which he euphuistically calls "hard names."

And how is it with Mr. Senator Hoar? There are three salient points in his speech: One is the fact that some of the Southern States have not yet emerged from the habits of violence and disregard of human life engendered by years of war and bloodshed. I admit it. So in the city of New York, and in some of the villages on Long Island, shocking and barbarous murders have been committed during this very last year by colored ruffians. It would be as well to argue from this that all colored men are ruffians, and that the constitutional amendments in behalf of the race were a great mistake, as to argue from the fact that some Democrats were murderers in Copiah, that all Southern Democrats are murderers, and ought therefore to be excluded from all participation in Federal affairs for an indefinite period.

Another point was made against the influence of Harvard College. Senator Hoar alleges that the influence of President Eliot, and of a little body of men about him, has "tended infinitely to degrade the public life of the Commonwealth." The only comment I make on all this, is to advise the honorable senator to walk through Memorial Hall, study the portraits, and read the tablets. President Eliot may not be an expert in the carriage business, or be practically wise on the tariff question, but why on this account he should figure so largely in Mr. Hoar's ratifying speech is beyond my comprehension.

The third point is the statesmanship of Mr. Blaine.

Since Mr. Hoar's speech was delivered, the "consummate flower" of Mr. Blaine's statesmanship has been exhibited, in the greatest effort of his life, his letter of acceptance of the

nomination, which Senator Hoar and his associate office-holders have been ratifying. The success with which he keeps out of view in this important paper all the questions that are of any immediate interest except to the jobbers and office-holders, is something remarkable. It is written all over, in big capitals, with Money! Money! Money! One would suppose the cry came from Wall Street, and not from a rural district in Maine. Mr. Blaine gloats over the big figures. He becomes enthusiastic and fanatic over the millions that we have added to the public wealth. Nay, millions are nothing; he launches into uncounted billions. It is enough to make the mouth water of all the jobbers and Star Route thieves in the country. His language and figures are very like the language and figures of the illustrious Ward. All these big profits, he avers, are the result of government legislation, as Ward's were the result of government contracts. Tremendous profits on paper! Money without beginning or end for somebody! For whom? Farmers of Berkshire, how much of it has ever found its way into *your* pockets? Some of it may be traced to Blaine, some to Dorsey, some to Brady, a good deal of it into the hands of the opulent Mr. Jones, who is running the Blaine machine in the city of New York till the election, more into the hands of the Goulds and the Sages and the Vanderbilts. All the rich men have been made a good deal richer, and all the poor men relatively poorer, by this legislation, that now threatens to bury personal honor and public virtue under an avalanche of gold. But the shrinkage, Mr. Blaine! How much of this fabulous wealth exists on paper only, for you cannot have forgotten how these profits from government undertakings sometimes wind up? It may be another Grant & Ward business: liabilities, \$16,000,000; nominal assets, \$27,000,000; actual assets, \$65,000.

I must say one word on the aggression question. All these speakers are apprehensive that if we make Grover Cleveland President, we shall not have a sufficiently aggressive policy. Aggression is to be the supplement of money to elect Mr. Blaine. Is he going to be more aggressive than the Democrats? The Democrats made rather an aggressive assault on the Constitution when they acquired Louisiana and the Floridas. The Democrats made the war against England of 1812. The Democrats announced the Monroe doctrine, and have never

abandoned it. The Democrats threatened France with war when she was sluggish in paying up, and they got the money. The Democrats annexed Texas. The Democrats cried out "54.40 or fight!" when the northwestern boundary was in dispute. The Democrats declared war against Mexico, and acquired California and New Mexico. I am not a Democrat. As far as these aggressions were in my time, I have not sympathized with them or approved them. One would suppose that this record is aggressive enough and American enough to make it extremely difficult for Mr. Blaine to better it.

July 20, 1884.

V.

THE DIVIDE OF THE SURPLUS.

Is it the Church and the School-House, or the Custom-House and Post-Office? — Caesar's Wife, and Slander.

BEFORE discussing new matters, permit me to refer to a topic treated in a former chapter. It has been observed that Mr. Blaine's Mulligan letters are not the only epistles of the gentleman to which we take exception. His letter on the policy of so taxing the people as to create an enormous surplus, and to distribute it among the States, was perhaps equally conclusive on the question of his fitness for the presidency. It was so treated; and it is gratifying to find that my views are confirmed by the views of Republicans, who in an eminent degree deserve and enjoy the public confidence. Senator John F. Andrew, son of our lamented war governor, says that the proposition of Mr. Blaine in this regard is "outrageous as well as unconstitutional," and "shows that he is not fit to hold the office which he seeks." James Speed, of Kentucky, the only surviving member of President Lincoln's cabinet, in a letter to a friend, dated the 19th inst., avers that "his [Blaine's] letter about the surplus revenue is monstrous," and "shows him to be as unsafe in his views of the framework of our government as he is in regard to international law." "Unconstitutional," "outrageous," "monstrous," demonstrating his unfitness for the presidency. Hard words these, Governor Robinson; why should

you or your friends desert your posts because "somebody" "flings insinuations at your candidate"?

But one word more for Senator Hoar. On reading his speech a second time, two or three reflections suggest themselves. Though he starts with the remark that he "brings no sneer at those whose judgment as to their duty may differ from his own," he alludes to President Eliot as an "innocent," and Mr. James Freeman Clarke as a "venerable doctor of divinity," in "Democratic alliance" with the murderers of Copiah. Their judgment differs from his own as to the propriety of elevating to the presidency a partisan with a "doubtful record," and he expresses himself with a sneer that amounts to emphatic contempt. The honorable senator, however, considers it a feather in Mr. Blaine's cap that his nomination is the "nomination of the church and of the school-house." Bishop Blaine and Schoolmaster Logan! Now of what church is Mr. Blaine the nominee? Of the Roman Catholic Church, or the Episcopal, or the church without a bishop? If this is not mere flummery and fustian, it is an averment that Mr. Blaine's nomination is that of an absolutely clerical convention. This whistling, singing, bawling, yelling, shrieking posse of office-holders, that ran wild at the sight of an empty helmet with a plume on it, and behaved like a mob let loose from Bedlam, Senator Hoar perhaps wishes us to regard as a convocation of clergymen and scholars. If this is true, it is capable of proof. Produce your vouchers, brother Hoar, and let us know if your church was any other than that in which Dorsey is head deacon, and Brady is trusted to hand round the plate.

It was *not* the nomination of the church and the school-house; the school-house and the church repudiate it. The nomination was that of the post-office and custom-house, that organization banded and entrenched, which finds its cohesive and impelling power in offices and jobs and contracts, in party spoils and public plunder. Two such masters in the art of wire-pulling, two men so versed in the tricks and trade of politics, two such shrewd tacticians in marshaling and managing the mercenaries of a party, two such adepts and experts in intrigue and strategy as Arthur and Blaine, have never before been pitted against each other in any contest for a presidential nomination. What they did not know about packing conventions was not worth knowing, and

their combined exertions brought together the most turbulent, unscrupulous, and greedy set of office-holders and office-seekers that were to be found in the country. Mr. Hoar himself lets out the fact that the convention was full of office-holders. He describes the men who voted for Arthur as a solid column of office-holders. Collector Robertson led the column for Blaine, and his followers were of the same stripe. Blaine had the advantage over Arthur of his ten years Federal experience in the business, and the master hands, the old staggers, the veteran jobbers, were bound to him by stronger attractions than they could find in the somewhat indolent and easy-going Arthur. They knew that when Blaine wrote his letter about the Surplus and the Divide, he meant business, and would not disappoint them. The "innocent" college president and the venerable divine were nowhere in the convention. The reformers, some three-score and ten in number, were sat down upon, incontinently; and, saddened, sickened, and humiliated, returned to their respective constituencies. Some of them concluded afterward to swallow the leek, and ratify. They eat crow and humble pie publicly, and call upon you, farmers of Berkshire, to show your "loyalty" to the "organization" by following their example. Decline the honor of dining with them on any such viands. They are not wholesome.

Now about Cæsar's wife. Mr. Codman had said at a meeting of Independents that all political parties hitherto in this country had acted on the belief that the presidential candidates ought to be, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. In the special application of this phrase he intends that they ought to be above the suspicion of having used their official position as the source of private emolument. Superiority to pecuniary inducements—a perfect immunity from the slightest mistrust on this score—has eminently characterized every man of any party except the Republican party who has ever occupied the presidential chair. No party before the Republican has ever put in nomination for that high place any man who has ever been charged with prostituting political office to personal gain. Judge Robinson was right when he said that no man of a "doubtful record" ought to be nominated to that office. Mr. Codman was perfectly right when he averred that a presidential candidate ought to be "above suspicion."

But what says Mr. Hoar? He does not think it all necessary. On the contrary, he thinks Cæsar a very base fellow for entertaining and acting on such a sentiment, and says "he never did a baser thing than when he abandoned his wife because somebody slandered her." Or, as Governor Robinson would phrase it, "flung insinuations;" or, as Senator Dawes would say, "vituperated;" or Representative Long, more gently, "abused" her. Senator Hoar unintentionally slanders Cæsar. The great man did not put his wife away because somebody slandered her. A young rake by the name of Clodius had been paying attentions to the lady, that were noticed and checked by the vigilance of her mother-in-law, who probably thought them a little too marked to be honorable to her son. For this state of affairs, Clodius was obliged to take some extra pains to gain access to Pompeia; and at a meeting exclusively of women, held for some religious ceremony at Cæsar's house, over which his wife presided, Clodius entered the house in a female disguise. He was discovered and ejected without ceremony, stripped of his garments. The affair created a great sensation, and was brought up in the the Senate, and in the College of Priests, where Clodius was charged with sacrilege. What other grounds Cæsar may have had to justify his actions we do not know. The terrible scandal made public the association of Clodius and Pompeia, with all that such an association implies. Cæsar as president of the College of Priests had acquiesced in the judgment. He separated from his wife. He did not charge her with criminality, but circumstances were against her; and he assigned as the reason for the divorce that Cæsar's wife must be above suspicion. Most gentlemen in our time would prefer a wife of that kind.

There were probably good reasons to doubt the complicity of Pompeia in the introduction of Clodius into the pontifical palace, and Cæsar gave her the benefit of the doubt by declining to intimate that he considered her guilty. But there is no such motive of delicacy to prevent men of sense from inquiring into the charges against Mr. Blaine. They were universally believed to be true at the time. The very leading and most widely circulated Republican journals, with the best opportunities for knowing the facts through their numerous correspondents and reporters, and with every inducement to sustain regular nominations.

reiterate these charges to-day, and on account of their knowledge of the candidate refuse to support him. In this view of the case, what rubbish is all this talk about "slander" and "vituperation" and "abuse," and with how little respect these "best men" treat the intelligence of the people, when they tell you, as Mr. Dawes tells you, that these charges, true or false, are "decorations" of his candidate, and make "fast friends."

Vituperation and abuse seem to have made "fast friends" of Senators Hoar and Dawes, but it was the vituperation and abuse of Massachusetts. I have a faint recollection of a field day somewhere when the "plumed knight" couched his lance and made a tilt at Massachusetts. The men who should have met him in that field and chastised him for his vulgar insolence made but a feeble defense, and Massachusetts was thought to have had the worst of it. Does Mr. Hoar remember that day? Does Mr. Dawes? Will they please rise and explain if it is the recollection of that day and scene that binds them by such links of iron to the cause of the "plumed knight," and to their remarkable estimate of his "decorations"?

July 24, 1884.

VI.

ORGANIZATION OF OFFICE-HOLDERS.

Bribing the People. — Audacious Evasion of Law.

BEFORE commenting further on the speeches of the office-holders at the Republican ratification meeting in Boston, I will tender the admission that all the office-holders and all Republican candidates, State and Federal, will rally and work for Blaine and Logan. The organization under Blaine in 1884 is identical in its aims and purposes with the organization under Van Buren in 1839. It is a struggle of the office-holders against reform. It is a struggle to perpetuate the organization which levies an hundred millions of unnecessary taxes on labor, that office-holders and their followings of jobbers, contractors, and speculators in politics may be enriched at the public expense. Here and there you will find a man like Senator Andrew, but there will be only a few such men; the maelstrom will suck in

the multitude. The idea of loyalty to the organization ; the instinct of official self-preservation ; the fear that if they do not hang together they may hang separately ; old habits ; familiar associations ; common interests weld together the links and rivets of a combination that involves the whole country in its folds, and presents almosts insuperable obstacles to every effort for reform.

It is now some eight years since Senator Hoar told us on a memorable occasion what he had seen and heard of the unworthiness of our public men. He had heard that "suspicion haunts the footsteps of the trusted companions of the President." He had heard in higher places than the Senate the "shameless doctrine avowed by men grown old in public office that the true way in which power should be gained in the republic is to bribe the people with the offices created for their service." He had heard from friendly lips at the time of the great Eastern Exposition that the only product of our institutions in which the United States excelled all other nations was corruption. This suspicion, this doctrine, this "friendly" indictment related to the Republicans then occupying our public places, — the very men who constitute and make up this organization of office-holders that now call upon the citizens of Berkshire for the votes that are necessary to continue them in power. Not one word of denial ; not one word of palliation ; not one expression intimating doubt or disbelief fell at that time from the lips of Senator Hoar. He acquiesced in, and accepted, the impeachment. And the honorable senator sustains for the presidency the man who would foster, expand, and intensify this corruption by continuing to raise from the tax-payers more than an hundred millions of dollars in excess of of our prodigal and profuse requirements, as a fund, *additional* to the offices, for bribing the people and perpetuating the power thus acquired.

But not one sneer from Senator Hoar, and not one remonstrance from his brother Ebenezer, special claimants both of the purity of the Puritans, — of saints political, the most sainted, — not a sarcasm, not even a suggestion from either of them in rebuke of this monstrous, this abominable proposition ! A petty tax on tea convulsed a continent in your fathers' times. Custom-house officers in those days were as busy in the service of the

ministers as they are now; but when they told the men of 1770 that taxation was a good thing, and the more they had of it the better, the men of 1770 gave them a dip in the briny bay, or treated them occasionally to a coat of feathers and tar. They did not dig out creeks to establish ports of entry, or establish ports of entry to build custom-houses at a cost of from \$50,000 to six or seven millions of dollars, as expedients toward squandering the money levied by an insidious and iniquitous taxation.

The corruption described by Senator Hoar is the fruit of the Surplus policy advocated by Mr. Blaine; and if it prevailed in 1876, it has been growing worse ever since. Hence it is that with an expenditure of four hundred millions in sixteen years in the navy department, we have to-day no available ships or armaments. Hence it is that with one year's expenditure of three millions and a half in the department of justice, Attorney-General Brewster fails to convict Brady, Kellogg, or Dorsey; and creates the impression in the public mind that the men whose footsteps "suspicion haunts," and the men who have "grown old in public service," will persistently extend an incidental protection to culprits who know too many office-holders' secrets to be in any danger of conviction. Hence it is that with this enormous expenditure in the department of justice, we are told by the officers in the land department that the public domain is in process of unlawful appropriation, in large tracts, by land thieves, and that it is impossible to arrest or punish their depredations. Hence it is that we have for years seen a powerful corporation, born in fraud, engineered in fraud, and managed in fraud, successfully defying all the power of the government, — by its lobby outside and its feed attorneys inside of Congress staving off remedial legislation, — and the attorney-general unwilling or unable to enforce even the provisions of those laws which Congress has succeeded in passing against the efforts of capital and corruption. Even the penny press of Rome has learned enough to fling its jibe at us, when it says that for every single brigand in the traditional costume that can be seared up in Italy, the United States can show a hundred in plain citizens' clothes.

The Union Pacific Rail Road is not the only important body that evades or defies the laws of the United States. Taxes

levied by imposts and duties are not the only taxes levied in the United States, and Congress is not the only body to levy them. The National Republican Committee is another tax levier, and another defier of the law. First Mr. Jones, the chairman, issues from 244 Fifth Avenue, city of New York, a circular to all Republicans "*in or out of office*," in which the committee "cheerfully calls the attention of every person holding any office, place, or employment under the United States, or any of the departments of the government, to the provisions of the act of congress entitled an act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, and states that *its influence will be exerted in conformity therewith*." Shortly afterward, this announcement is followed by a circular dated from No. 1142 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C., which abstains carefully from the statement that its influence will be exerted in conformity with the provisions of the act of congress. Five individuals, three of whom describe themselves as chairman, secretary, and treasurer, represent in this circular that they have been requested by the Republican National committee to act as a finance committee for the District of Columbia in the collection of funds "*to be used by the said national committee in the present political campaign*." To be "*used*" in the political campaign! For what purpose? In the light shed upon "trusted companions" of our presidents, and of Republicans in "higher places" than the Senate, upon the practices as well as the doctrines of these men, to what use is this money to be applied? Can you doubt that the object of this fund is to buy votes? And who are called upon to furnish the money? We all know that the only men in the District of Columbia to pay money for the "*campaign*" of the office-holders are the men who hold office, place, or employment under the United States or some one of the departments of the government. It was for their protection, as well as for the honor of the country, that the act in question was passed. It is that act which these gentlemen inform us they intend to evade. A blue-covered campaign pamphlet in the interest of the Republican candidate commends highly the "audacity" of Blaine as the conspicuous trait in his character. He has succeeded in imparting that audacity to A. M. Clapp, chairman, Green B. Raum, treasurer, and W. H. Loudermilk, secretary, of this finance

committee that have fitted up their headquarters in Washington, in the neighborhood of the departments, for the express purpose of violating the law of the United States, designed to protect clerks in the departments from this infamous imposition of blackmail, while General Joe Hawley, at the ratification meeting in New York, "pointed with pride to the fact that there was an end to political assessments!"

In reply to some adverse comments on these chapters, I would simply say that if any one will point out a misstatement it will give me great pleasure to correct it. I would repeat that I am not a Democrat, and I have never voted for a Democratic President. I am no office-holder or office-seeker. I have no interest whatever which is not in common with the interests of my brother farmers, and I have no desire under heaven but so to cast my vote that it may enure to the prosperity, liberty, and honor of my country.

August 1, 1884.

VII.

CLEVELAND'S NOMINATION FORCED BY THE PEOPLE.

The Issue is, Shall Reform or Jobbery Win? — The Spoils and the Ring.

IN response to numerous letters from friends of the office-holders' organization, Judge Robinson has collected in a pamphlet several very ingenious articles on the presidential question, intended to show why Blaine should be elected our chief magistrate. His task, though self-imposed, is a very difficult one. To prove that a man whom, in his judgment, the Republicans ought not to nominate, the people of the United States ought to elect, involves an enigma that puzzles plain men like myself, and that can be guessed at only by the few who are unusually clever in reading riddles and solving conundrums. If a man is so objectionable that he ought not even to be nominated, the only way, it seems, to correct the error is to elect him. In political geometry this is certainly the *Pons Asinorum*.

It is to be regretted that Judge Robinson did not reprint, with the papers now before us, the able and conclusive article

in which he demonstrated that Blaine ought not to be nominated. Its exclusion from the series is very remarkable. The missing statue in the Roman procession excited more curiosity and comment than the statues which were paraded. Fortunately the written word stands. Before coming to the articles intended to show that Blaine ought to be elected, let us look at the fatal objections to his nomination distinctly formulated by Judge Robinson before the meeting of the Chicago convention. Admitting Blaine to be "popular, magnetic, and brilliant," "accomplished, able, and patriotic," — which is pushing his case to the full extent, — admitting all this, Judge Robinson alleged that the "*fatal danger* of his nomination remains the same, because it is known that the certain revolt of the Independents in New York would *overwhelm him and the party in defeat*. There is no doubt among intelligent and impartial men of the power of the independent voters. *The unparalleled defeat of Secretary Folger settles that question.*" The delegates, he wrote, should not be diverted from this consideration by "discussing the charges against Blaine." It is singular how strictly this kind of diversion is avoided by all Mr. Blaine's advocates. "It is sufficient to know," the Judge continued, "that his nomination would *defeat and destroy the party.*" "*From any and all standpoints,*" he added with a determination that nobody should misunderstand or misrepresent him, "*from any and all standpoints, Blaine's nomination would be a fatal and irretrievable mistake.*" Then leaving the individual and extending the range of his observations, after a discussion of President Arthur's claims to the nomination, he generalizes the situation with the emphatic announcement, "*no man of doubtful record or policy should be nominated.*" At the time, the remark was applicable and applied to Blaine. After reading Carl Schurz's recent masterly speech at Brooklyn, nobody can treat Mr. Blaine's record as a doubtful one. There is no longer any question about it. Nor can any man of intelligence read the letters of 1880 lately republished in the "Springfield Republican," from its correspondents at Augusta and Boston, and hesitate as to the place to be assigned to Mr. Blaine as contractor, jobber, haunter of the departments, commissary, lobbyist, speculator, broker, magnetizer, galvanizer, and corruptionist.

It is not my intention in presenting the issues of this presidential canvass to rely on any other authority than the documents and the facts which they prove. I refer now to Mr. Schurz, because he has long been a familiar and trusted authority on matters of interest to the Republican party. Three generations of able, patriotic, truth-loving, and truth-telling men have established the "Springfield Republican" in the confidence of the people of Western Massachusetts. I feel assured that nothing would find admission to its columns on a public question which came from an unreliable or doubtful source. Hence it is that in the present connection I satisfy myself with citing the "Republican" and Mr. Schurz in confirmation of the case against Mr. Blaine, with the confident assertion that no impartial and intelligent voter can examine the speech and the letters in question, without arriving at the conclusion that Judge Robinson arrived at in regard to Mr. Blaine's nomination, that his *election* would be a "fatal and irretrievable mistake."

So much of the Judge's pamphlet as relates to the question of party loyalty I have discussed in a previous chapter. In the aspect in which it is now presented, it is nothing under heaven but a question of fidelity to the organization of office-holders, engaged in a struggle for self-preservation. It is not necessary to repeat what I have already suggested in this regard.

The most elaborate and perhaps the most able article in this series is that in which Judge Robinson arraigns the Democratic convention for the rules which it adopted for its own guidance. It seems that the unit rule gave Cleveland the nomination, and that rule is not approved by the Judge. Why? One reason is that it is anti-Democratic. Would not one think that this might be a recommendation to the Judge, in view of his idea of Democracy? The Democrats were not Democratic enough for him! The adoption of the rule was a "shameful, anti-Democratic, and revolting piece of machine despotism." Why, again? Because it disfranchises John Kelly and his strikers from the city of New York. The Democratic convention did not consider this a great calamity. They were pretty prompt in doing Mr. Kelly's business for him, without manifesting any reluctance whatever. The Judge asks if bolting Republicans can vote to sanction such boss methods and tyranny like this? Now as long as the Democratic convention did precisely what

the bolting Republicans wanted them to do, is it rational to suppose that they would quarrel with the process by which the Democrats reached the result? What is it to them that the Democratic process is anti-Democratic? Why should they figure as mourners at John Kelly's funeral?

Now for the climax, with which I shall dismiss this part of the case. "Cleveland's nomination," says the Judge, "is as pure a product of official patronage, packed primaries, boss despotism, and bastard reform, as our politics have ever furnished." Let us look at this a moment. The leader of the Blaine men in the Republican Convention was the collector of customs in the city of New York, a man for whom Collector Merritt, against the united voice of the business men of the city, was displaced through the influence of Mr. Blaine. This collectorship has for half a century been considered the most important factor in a presidential contest, as far as the State of New York is concerned. John Quincy Adams writes in his diary, in 1840, "The long agony is over, and Edward Curtis is appointed collector of New York." This "long agony" is about all there was of President Harrison's administration. The contest was between Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster, which should get control of the New York Custom-House, and the contest was a bitter one, resulting in the triumph of the Secretary of State. The importance of this stronghold Mr. Blaine recognized, and he seized the opportunity of placing his man there in good season. He did not make any mistake about it, and when the Chicago convention assembled, "official patronage, packed primaries, boss despotism, and bastard reform" were so represented in the person of Mr. Blaine's Collector Robertson that the President *regnant* himself was to all intents nowhere in the fight for the Republican nomination. I do not think the Independent Republicans will distress themselves at the processes by which the Democratic convention reached their conclusions. But every one who has watched what Mr. Decoration Dawes calls the "political currents" (I really owe an apology to the honorable senator for neglecting so long his speech at the ratification meeting of the office-holders in Boston) knows that Mr. Cleveland's nomination was simply the result of a popular sentiment in his favor too strong to be resisted. It was a concession of the Democratic party to the

American people. The "political currents" run unmistakably in the direction of reform, and we can only obtain reform by the agency of a reform President. And when Judge Robinson says that Blaine and Logan "represent the platform of the Chicago convention, *with the exception of the plank relating to the reform of the civil service,*" he defines distinctly and squarely the issue between reform in the person of Cleveland and jobbery in the person of Blaine.

Another argument against voters exercising their independent judgment in casting their vote for the chief magistrate is, that the Democratic party "originated" the spoils system. This means that William L. Marey, some fifty years ago, in the Senate of the United States, *apropos* to we forget what, in a crisp and sententious expression, crystallized the idea that to the "victors belong the spoils." That is all there is about the Democratic origin of the spoils system. But the Judge says further, that the Democrats *advocate* the spoils system. This is to say, that for twenty years they have held in theory a doctrine which the Republicans, during that period, have put in practice. This shows certainly that whatever opinions the Democrats hold they have held them honestly. "Where the carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered." The Democrats knew where the spoils were. If they were in pursuit of them, the way to get them was to bargain with the Republican ring. The Republican National Committee were ready to buy them, and to pay for them. They are ready to do it now. It is for this very purpose that, in audacious violation of the law, a committee is now sitting in Washington, under the shadow of the treasury department, to levy taxes on the employés of the government. Honest citizens ought to throw the whole material of the establishment into the Potomac, and draw the personal out of Washington at the cart's tail.

But while the Democrats out in the cold have been theorizing on the spoils system, what have our Republican candidates been doing? Let us begin with Mr. Blaine as a contractor in war times. He goes to the war department to offer his services to Mr. Cameron for furnishing guns. "Oh," says Mr. Cameron, "you are a manufacturer of guns?" "No," says Mr. Blaine. "In the hardware and cutlery line?" says Mr. Cameron. "Not entirely," rejoins Mr. Blaine. "Well," the secretary must have

asked, if he did his duty, "what knowledge have you of this business that leads you to think your services will be valuable to the government?" "Why, sir," says Mr. Blaine, rising to the occasion, "I have been three years in the State of Kentucky 'teaching the young idea how to shoot.'" "Oh," says the secretary, "you are an expert, then, in firearms?" "Just so," says Mr. Blaine, "I am an expert, and Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives in Maine." Mr. Cameron understands the situation, touches his gong, and tells the chief clerk to make a contract with Mr. Blaine for Spencer rifles.

Now here is the point in this transaction. Mr. Blaine had no knowledge whatever of the business he wished to contract for, and enjoyed no special opportunities for making himself useful to the country. He simply came in as a middle-man, with important political influence, to stand between the producer and the consumer, — the man who made the guns and the government which wanted to use them, — and to take the lion's share of the profits. He stood, brother farmers, in the same relation to the government as the man stands to you who buys your milk for two cents and a half, and sells it in New York for ten — well watered. Of course, our patriotic contractor bought as low as possible of the manufacturers, and sold as high as possible to the war department, and all that he received in the way of profit was so much money lost to the treasury, — but then he was Speaker of the House of Representatives in the State of Maine. This was the use of his political and official influence for personal advantage in a case where the only service he could possibly render the government was to take a very liberal commission out of it. I do not doubt Mr. Blaine's patriotism. There are several kinds of patriotism. This is Mr. Blaine's kind, — and he has kept up this reputation from the time of gun contracts down to the exhibition of the Mulligan correspondence.

So much for the spoils system and the Democrats. For twenty years they have been wandering in the wilderness without a chance at the flesh-pots, while Blaine has been handling the spoils and enriching himself and his friends. And how is it with Logan? He defended President Grant against the scathing attacks of Sumner on his nepotism, and averred that the man was a heathen who would not provide for his own house-

hold. And Logan by that token is no heathen, when the spoils are in question. *Ecce Signum.*

Cornelius A. Logan, a cousin of John Alexander, Minister to Chili.

W. F. Tucker, Jr., a son-in-law, Paymaster in the United States Army.

John A. Logan, Jr., son, cadet at West Point.

John M. Cunningham, brother-in-law, Second Lieutenant Nineteenth Infantry.

Samuel S. Errett, brother-in-law, Assistant Superintendent Yellowstone National Park.

Cyrus Thomas, brother-in-law, ethnologist Smithsonian Institute.

Viola Thomas, niece, daughter of Cyrus, clerk Smithsonian Institute.

Susie Cunningham, sister-in-law, clerk in Treasury Department.

Enoch Blanchard, nephew, clerk in the Railway Postal Service.

Mollie E. Jenkins, niece, clerk in the Marine Hospital Service.

James Cunningham, brother-in-law, Postmaster at Birmingham, Ala.

Samuel K. Cunningham, brother-in-law, Inspector Chicago Custom House.

James V. Logan, brother, postmaster, Murphysboro, Ill.

Edward Hill, nephew, Deputy United States Marshal, Southern District of Illinois.

Mary H. Brady, former servant, clerk in Treasury Department.

Louis Norris, former servant, messenger in Interior Department, Washington.

Daniel Shepherd, private secretary, Assistant Postmaster at Chicago.

Beach Taylor, private secretary, clerk in the United States Senate.

Who will say after reading this that Logan is a heathen? Does not it prove that he is as incapable of being a heathen as Blaine is of being a deadhead in any profitable government enterprise? And when you compare the achievements in gathering the spoils manifested by these "decorated" (see Dawes on Decorations) candidates, is not it a little absurd to talk about the "spoils" of the Democrats, who have not had a crust from the treasury for twenty years? And don't you think, brother farmers, that you are bound to take off your coats and turn in and help these spoils-men, with Powell Clayton, Stephen W. Dorsey, Secor Robeson, Bill Chandler, Stephen B. Elkins, John Roach, Schuyler Colfax, Brady, Kellogg, Keifer, and company, as a cabinet council to distribute the places, control the post-office, the custom-house, and all the departments, manage

the expenditures of a most extravagant administration of the public service, with the nice little sum of a hundred millions surplus to "Divide" in the most profitable manner that their ring can devise? More anon.

August 10, 1884.

CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES.

SECOND PART.

BY A BERKSHIRE FARMER.

VIII.

OUT OF THE FRYING PAN INTO THE FIRE.

The Result of Blaine's taking Forty-four Millions of his Countrymen into his Confidence.

SHORTLY after the nomination of Mr. Blaine at Chicago, there was a ratification meeting at Washington which was addressed by Senator Frye, of Maine. The honorable senator then told his audience that in 1876 the Democrats had an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives, and that they deliberately determined to tear the laurels off the brow of the great Republican leader and make him bend low before the American people. Thereupon, as Mr. Frye stated it, one day Blaine went into the House, and observing that he proposed to take into his confidence fifty [forty-four] millions of his countrymen, went on "without oratory, without ornamentation, and told his *story*, and when he completed the *tale* he charged upon the Democrats of the House, and routed them, horse, foot, and dragoons." Mr. Frye wound up with a hissing hot peroration. "As Blaine," he said, "on the day of his magnificent performance in the House, couched his lance and made an onset on the Democrats which they would remember forever, so he would now again couch his lance, and he and Logan, fighting shoulder to shoulder," would do very much the same thing that Blaine and Frye did in the House.

Mr. Frye modestly omitted to refer to his own magnificent performance on that occasion. He might have said, "All which I saw and part of which I was." He ought to have stated that he then played Sancho Panza to Mr. Blaine's Don Quixote: and

that, more fortunate than the illustrious squire, he is in the actual enjoyment of the kingdom which his master promised him. We all remember the doughty knight-errant's onset on the windmills, and his gallant cry, "Fly not, ye cowards and vile caitiffs, *for it is a single knight who assaults you.* . . . Although ye should have more arms than the giant Briareus, ye shall pay for it." He "set his lance in rest," and shattered it into shivers in the sail of the first windmill, with the magnificent result of being tumbled heels over head on the field, so bruised and battered that his man Sancho had as much as he could do to pick up the pieces. Mr. Blaine's experience on the occasion referred to was more like that of Don Quixote in his bout with the windmill than that of a plumed knight routing his enemies.

Let me tell the tale as the Congressional Debates tell it. Unscrupulous Republican journals do not hesitate to assure their readers that after a careful investigation of the charges against Blaine by an impartial congressional committee he was *proved not guilty, and was honorably acquitted.* This is a falsehood pure and unadorned. Senator Frye's rhodomontade may be styled the rhetorical or ornamented falsehood. In what follows you may read the truth: —

On the 31st of January, 1876, a resolution was offered in the House of Representatives by Mr. Luttrell, of California, instructing the judiciary committee to inquire into and report upon the affairs of the Pacific railroads, which had received subsidies from the United States in land or money, with a view of ascertaining if these subsidies had been properly applied, and if any claims against the companies from non-feasance or malfeasance had accrued to the United States. The resolution was in terms broad enough to cover any and every transaction of the railroads down to the time of its adoption. A week previously a resolution had been adopted for the appointment of a special committee of five members, to inquire into the nature and history of a real estate pool in which Jay Cooke & Co. were interested. On the third day of April this special committee received additional powers from the House to investigate matters touching alleged official misconduct of any officer of the government or any member of the House that might be brought to their attention. Rumors concerning alleged misdoings of the railroads

were in circulation, which were supposed more or less to implicate Mr. Blaine. On the 24th of April, Mr. Blaine thought it judicious to meet one of these rumors by rising in the House to a personal explanation in reference to the alleged sale of certain bonds of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad to the Union Pacific. What he stated on that occasion is not pertinent to my present purpose, but will receive due attention in a subsequent chapter. On the 2d of May the House adopted a resolution which contemplated an investigation by the judiciary committee of that specific transaction.

In the course of this investigation two witnesses were summoned to whom only it is now necessary to refer, — Warren Fisher and James Mulligan. On the evening of their arrival in Washington, Fisher and Mulligan were waited upon by Mr. Blaine before they had reported themselves to the committee. Fisher went to Mr. Blaine's house on his invitation. Mulligan, however, declined, very properly, on the ground that he wished to take the stand on the following day "untrammelled by conversation of any kind with anybody." Twice Mr. Blaine sent special messengers to induce Mulligan to accept his invitation. As this solicitation did not fetch him, Blaine and Fisher went in person to the Riggs House and there had an interview with Mulligan. Blaine requested and entreated Mulligan to deliver to him certain letters which he had addressed to Warren Fisher, and which Mulligan had brought with him from Boston to corroborate any statement that he might have occasion to make to the committee. Fisher had given them to Mulligan for this purpose. Mulligan resisted Blaine's entreaties, though they were reinforced by tears, threats of suicide, and proffered bribes of political office or a foreign consulship, for which Mulligan told him he had no inclination. Blaine then said, "Let me see the letters to peruse them." Blaine pledged his honor that he would return them, and they were given to him to read. He read them once or twice and returned them. Mulligan took the letters and retired into his room. Blaine followed him, and after Mulligan's positive refusal to deliver the letters, Blaine said, "I want to re-read those letters again, and I want to have them for that purpose." Mulligan, on the same pledge of honor, delivered the letters to Blaine, and with them his own private memorandum of their contents. Blaine pocketed the letters

and the memorandum, and Mulligan's earnest and impassioned demand for their restoration Blaine met with an absolute refusal.

The truth of this statement is not denied. Mulligan had the letters by right, and intended to use them, if it were necessary, to protect his own reputation, which he heard was to be assailed. If he held them wrongfully there was a lawful way for Blaine to get possession of them. But whether he held them by right or wrong is nothing to the purpose. Blaine pledged his honor for the possession of them, and the thing pledged lies in Mulligan's keeping to this day. Mulligan will live and die the pawnee of the unredeemed honor of James G. Blaine. I treat this subject now without reference to the contents of the letters. We do not know their contents, and we never shall know them ; but we know enough of them. A man who is capable of taking and retaining a package of letters by a lie is capable of tampering with such a package by suppression, substitution, or enlargement of its contents. Under such circumstances every presumption of law is against the man guilty of the violence and falsehood. Even the audacious Mr. Blaine does not successfully in any respect impeach Mr. Mulligan's veracity. When he made his "magnificent performance" in the House chronicled by Mr. Frye, Mr. Blaine sneered at Mr. Mulligan as "that man," or "this man," or as the "famous witness." He averred that Mulligan had "selected, out of correspondence running over a great many years, letters which he thought would be peculiarly damaging to [him]." There is no truth in this averment. With a single exception, the letters were written between 1869 and 1872, — most of them after 1870, — and most of these related to the "little transaction," or "small flyer," in the Northern Pacific, and to Blaine's relations with the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad. "He came here *loaded with them*," says Blaine. They were not many in number, but they were a heavy weight to carry, — particularly for the writer of them. "He came here for a sensation. He came here primed. He came here on that particular errand: I was advised of it, and I obtained those letters under circumstances which have been notoriously scattered through the United States, and are known to everybody."

Yes, Mr. Mulligan went to Washington summoned by a com-

mittee of the House of Representatives. He carried with him certain documents which on their face, as they were read by Mr. Blaine himself, related to the subject-matter of their inquiry. Mr. Blaine obtained and retained those documents by a falsehood which he bragged of as publicly known to everybody. No wonder that the "Plumed Knight" confessed some sense of "humiliation" and a "mortification" that he did not pretend to conceal, when of the letters thus filched from the honest accountant the very best he could say for himself was, "I am not afraid to show the letters. Thank God Almighty, I am not ashamed to show them." "There they are" (holding up a package of letters). But he did not show them; he read them himself, and instead of sending them to the Speaker's desk he folded them up and put them in his pocket. And the opportunity of thus parading the spoils thus infamously won from an honest witness Mr. Blaine supplemented by an uncalled-for and unjustifiable attack on the honor and good faith of the judiciary committee, as a question of "high privilege." As if Mr. Blaine were altogether superior to all ordinary processes of jurisdiction, he introduced a resolution instructing the judiciary committee to "*report forthwith to the House*" whether or not they had sent a telegram to Josiah Caldwell, or had heard by telegram or otherwise from Josiah Caldwell, and to what effect, and why the telegram had been suppressed. Mr. Blaine asserted that it was now far into the fifth day since Mr. Knott, chairman of the judiciary committee, had received a telegram from Mr. Caldwell and had suppressed it, — as if every volunteer telegram bearing on an individual or a case pending before the judiciary committee should be at once circulated for the benefit of whom it might concern. The imputation was insulting and the claim of right in the last degree absurd. Mr. Knott expressed his belief that the telegram was a put-up job, as it undoubtedly was, and repelled the charge of suppressing it with just indignation. Mr. Blaine's resolution was referred to the judiciary committee.

To complete the history of this "magnificent performance" it is indispensable to mention Mr. Frye's part in it. Mr. Blaine was permitted to tell his story and read his letters without interruption, except an occasional remark interjected by his colleague, Mr. Frye, who was on the judiciary committee, act-

ing not as Mr. Blaine's "attorney" but as his "friend," and took occasion to ask a question when it would bring out a point for the defense. Mr. Hale, assisted by an occasional preconcerted inquiry or suggestion. When the chairman of the subcommittee undertook to reply to some of Mr. Blaine's imputations, Mr. Frye interrupted him during his short speech just *forty-four* times, when Mr. Blaine took up the business and interrupted him twelve times more; and in reply to Mr. Blaine's insinuation that the judiciary committee intended to do something to prevent his nomination at the presidential convention then soon to meet at Cincinnati, Mr. Knott said that he would be pleased to see him nominated, adding, "If he [Blaine] should receive the nomination and be elected in the face of all the facts, all we can say is, May the Lord have mercy on the American people."

Nothing came of this magnificent performance of Blaine and his bottle-holders. It was simply an exhibition of shameless and matchless effrontery, — of impudence actually astounding. It served, however, to put on the record Mr. Blaine's defense and the letters which made the defense necessary. *Qui s'excuse s'accuse.*

Shortly afterwards came the historical sunstroke.

The Cincinnati convention followed. The facts were fresh in the public mind, and the result of Mr. Blaine's grandiloquently taking into his confidence forty-four millions of the American people was his loss of the Republican nomination. It was confidence singularly misplaced.

August 20.

IX.

SPEAKER BLAINE AND HIS SPLENDID THING IN THE NORTH PACIFIC.

An Open Letter to two Senators and an Ex-Governor.

GENTLEMEN, — I should regret to believe that you are, all and each, jointly and severally, engaged in an earnest, persistent, and utterly unscrupulous endeavor to demoralize the public sentiment of Massachusetts on questions of vital importance to

the Commonwealth. Though understood to be, for the best of reasons and for a long series of years, opposed to the elevation of James G. Blaine to the presidency, from interested and partisan inducements you first reluctantly acquiesced in his nomination, and you are now openly and enthusiastically in the field in his behalf, and from explanations and excuses have warmed yourselves up to the language of eulogy and adulation. There is one apology for you. Pardon me if, without any disrespect to the profession, I remind my brother farmers that you are all — more or less — lawyers. From the time of your admission to the bar you have been in the habit of accepting retainers for arguing in any case indifferently for plaintiff or defendant, and have always been ready to argue as warmly and sincerely for the one as for the other. You have been always ready for a professional consideration to

“Give forkèd council, take provoking gold
From either side.”

I do not say this to your personal disparagement. When a man calls upon you and puts up the fee, you are bound to give him the benefit of your best ability and your most sincere convictions, in placing such a construction on the facts and law of his case as will best subserve his interest. In the language of Mr. Blaine to his friend Fisher, in doing so you would naturally “obey your first and best impulse.” This is not discreditable; but pardon me again if I say that to us farmers it seems that a habit of this kind begets inevitably an utter indifference to the real merits of the controversy. You always go in to win; and your client is always “stainless;” the facts that appear to his disadvantage are always “decorations;” and if you can so twist the law and the facts as to secure a verdict and a judgment in his favor, you retire with an easy conscience, though you are certain that you have duped the jury and misled the court.

These habits of thought and speech you bring with you into the discussion of public questions, and they have led you into utterances entirely unworthy of you, and of which gentlemen not professional advocates would have much reason to be ashamed.

To these remarks I am led just now by a perusal of the recent letter of Mr. Senator Hoar, in reply to the Brooklyn speech of Mr. Carl Schurz. In this letter Mr. Hoar undertakes to

narrow down the case against Mr. Blaine to the charge that he had a bad motive in his suggestions to Fisher, with the view of securing from Caldwell an interest in the bed-rock of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad. If these suggestions are capable of a creditable construction, Mr. Hoar says that there is an end of the case against Mr. Blaine; for this is the whole of it. With an audacity which rivals that of his distinguished client, the honorable senator avers to his dear young friend, whom he is endeavoring to train up in the way he should go, that “Mr. Blaine is not *charged with any corrupt, improper or wrong act whatever.*” Mr. Hoar knows perfectly well that the Little Rock and Fort Smith business is but the beginning of the charges against Mr. Blaine, that it is but an item in the charges, and by no means the most important item, — one circumstance only towards establishing the main charge, that Mr. Blaine has been from the start a jobber of his political interest and influence; a lobbyist in the departments and in Congress, before and after he became a member of the lower House. The picturesque description given us by Senator Edmunds felicitously embodies and illustrates the charges against Mr. Blaine. That description will survive; and it will go down in history, that whenever Mr. Thurman and the senator from Vermont — *Arcades ambo* — joined hands to defeat any of Jay Gould’s schemes for getting the better of the government, “James G. Blaine *invariably* started up from behind Gould’s breast-works, musket in hand.”

Yes, and a Spencer rifle, at that! But the Spencer-rifle case does not come on to-day, nor the Little Rock and Fort Smith, which I leave in the hands of Mr. Carl Schurz.

My present purpose is to exhibit from the documents the relations of Mr. James G. Blaine to the Northern Pacific Railroad. To these relations Mr. Schurz refers very casually, but in my judgment he will find in them, on some future occasion, matter well worthy of public attention. Let us review the facts as they appear in the Congressional Record.

The act granting lands for the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Lake Superior to Puget Sound — a railroad not yet completed — was signed by President Lincoln on the 2d of July, 1864. There were many well-known gentlemen among the beneficiaries named in the act, such as William E. Chandler,

of New Hampshire, John Gregory Smith, of Vermont, Ulysses S. Grant, of Illinois, and notably Richard D. Rice, of Augusta, Me., whose name heads the list, and who was a most efficient and influential friend of the enterprise. The corporate title was the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. The commissioners named in the act organized in the fall of 1864, and elected Josiah Perham president of the organization. In the year 1866 a resolution was passed by Congress, extending the time for building the road for two years. The passage of such resolutions, though apparently a matter of course, always calls for a certain amount of influence and manipulation, and, I am sorry to say, a modicum of what the Republican humorists of the Blaine and Dorsey stamp are accustomed to call soap. In 1868 another resolution, extending the time again, and changing the charter in some respects, was called for, with more influence, more manipulation, and more soap. In 1869 a further resolution was necessary, authorizing the branch from Portland, Oregon, to Puget Sound,—an important resolution, with the usual influence, manipulation, and soap annexed. Mr. Blaine was at the time Speaker of the House of Representatives. Legislation with its accompaniments two years in succession, and as yet apparently no provision for the Speaker! It was high time for the Speaker to come to the front. We find him on hand. During the summer following the passage of this resolution, the Speaker spoke to his friend Fisher “about purchasing an interest in the Northern Pacific Railroad for [himself] and any [he] might choose to associate with [himself].” The thing had then got into such a shape that the Speaker thought he could make a turn in it, perhaps in a quiet way through his neighbor Rice, of Augusta. His friends, however, did not come up to the mark. Whatever was his prospect of handling an interest at the time, the agreement or understanding was not sufficiently distinct to be insisted upon. The Speaker’s sad experience on this occasion may have been the source of his anxiety that Mr. Caldwell should make his “proposition definite” on the arrangement in the Little Rock business.

“The matter passed by,” wrote Mr. Blaine to his friend Fisher, “without my being able to control it, and nothing more was said about it.” It was one of those cases, evidently, where the least said the soonest mended.

Mr. Blaine, however, was too "graceful and efficient" a Speaker to be *left*, in an enterprise of this kind. Bottling up his resentment, he watched his opportunities. He did not have to wait long. In 1870 a very important resolution was acted upon by Congress, authorizing the Northern Pacific Railroad to issue its mortgage bonds and for other purposes; and there was a very loud call, of course, for more influence, more manipulation, and more soap. On the 31st of May in that year the resolution was certified by Schuyler Colfax, President of the Senate, and James G. Blaine, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and approved by U. S. Grant, President of the United States. Since that time all these gentlemen have attained a very disreputable prominence in financial and speculative circles.

The passage of this resolution was the turning-point in the history of the Northern Pacific Railroad. Before this time the original commissioners had failed in all their schemes for floating the enterprise, and had sold out their interests for \$200,000 or some other inconsiderable sum to J. Gregory Smith, R. D. Rice, William G. Moorhead, and their associates. One month afterwards, on the first day of July, 1870, an indenture was made between the Northern Pacific Railroad, of the first part, and Jay Cooke and John Edgar Thomson, of Philadelphia, trustees, of the second part, for the issue and the security of the bonds authorized by this important resolution. Meanwhile the interests in the road had been divided into twenty-four parts, twelve of which were assigned to Jay Cooke, to be used in pushing his sale of the bonds and "for other purposes." The other twelve remained in the hands of Smith, Rice, Windom, Moorhead, and others, who recouped their expenses out of the first issue of bonds, and held their shares gratuitously as compensation for their smartness and sagacity. They organized by appointing themselves directors, and made J. Gregory Smith, of St. Albans, Vt., president, and R. D. Rice, of Augusta, Me., vice-president. From Augusta, Me., a few weeks after all this, Mr. Speaker Blaine writes to his friend Fisher that the "*additional legislation has been obtained*;" and, by a "strange revolution of circumstances," he adds, "I am again able to control an interest, and if you desire it you can have it."

Rest here a moment and reflect on the charges necessarily involved in this mere statement of facts. Suppose that Mr.

Speaker Blaine had never written or spoken one word more on the subject, how would it stand? In 1869 he had an interest in the Northern Pacific, or thought he had, but lost control of it. In 1870 there was "additional legislation" — James G. Blaine in the Speaker's chair, familiar with the channels in which he could make himself useful, and the modes of bringing his official services to the notice of parties in interest. Jay Cooke became financial agent of the company. It was again on its legs, and R. D. Rice, of Augusta, Me., was its vice-president. James G. Blaine, of Augusta, Me., and Speaker of the House, by this "strange revolution of circumstances," regained control of the interest which he had previously lost. Is there any connection between this legislation and this control? Is there any connection between Jay Cooke and this control? Is there any connection between Vice-President Rice, of Augusta, Me., and this control? Cut off the whole matter here, and will Mr. Senator Hoar advise his dear young friend that these facts do not charge Mr. Blaine with anything "improper" or "wrong"? Does he design or desire to corrupt the political morals of his dear young friend?

If Mr. Hoar sees nothing improper or wrong, Mr. Blaine has a clearer moral perception than the honorable senator. Let us resume the investigation. When, under the circumstances stated, Mr. Blaine reopens the negotiation with his friend Fisher, what face does he put on the transaction? He describes the interest he controls with an unctuous exhibition of its possibilities. It was a matter of \$425,000 of stock and 275,000 acres of land, which he controlled, and the "whole thing" could be had for \$25,000, "less than one third of what some other sales of small interests have gone at." Now, was it right and proper for a Speaker of the House who had taken part in this "additional legislation" to accept the "control" of this interest for one third of what other people were paying for similar interests, or to accept it at all? Mr. Hoar thinks there is nothing corrupt, nothing even improper, in this! What did Mr. Blaine think of it at the time? If it was an honorable transaction, why should Mr. Blaine have hesitated to tell his friend Fisher just what his "control" amounted to, and how he got it? Why should he have said or written, "The chance is a very rare one. *I can't touch it*, but I obey my first and

best impulse in offering it to you." "All such chances as this since Jay Cooke got the road have been accompanied with the obligation to take a large amount of the bonds at 90, and hold them not less than three years." "Of course, in conferring with others, *keep my name quiet*, mentioning it to no one but Mr. Caldwell."

What did the Speaker offer to his friend Fisher? An interest that he had acquired in the Northern Pacific Railroad. Why did he say that he could not touch it, when he was touching it all the time? One reason was to impress upon his friend Fisher that he had acquired this interest through his official influence, and that such a rare opportunity could not have occurred to a person less influential and important. This would seemingly enhance its value and account for the large estimate that the Speaker had put upon it. Then, again, it would naturally occur to Fisher, If this is such a splendid thing, why does not Blaine keep it himself? The objection was anticipated, and Blaine meets it in advance. "I can't touch it" (innuendo) because it is by my official position only that I am able to acquire it. Hence this inexpensive and judicious parade of delicacy that must have amused Fisher very much indeed.

"I can't touch it," says the virtuous Mr. Blaine; but he was evidently extremely anxious to get \$25,000 for it for somebody. Was it for Jay Cooke or for Richard D. Rice that he was "placing" these securities, or was it for James G. Blaine? He was not above doing a brokerage business for a handsome commission. He could not "touch" it, but he could "control" it in the interest of anybody who could pay him \$25,000. He could sell it, or buy it, or deliver it; but he could not think of touching it. Mr. Blaine considered that improper. Fisher could have the whole thing for \$25,000; but perhaps he would not care to invest so much himself. In that case he could bring in ten of his friends to take each a "small flyer," or five of them to have a "splendid thing" of it, — a thing which even the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States might consider and call absolutely splendid. But splendid as it was, and dog-cheap as it was, and rare as the chance was, the Speaker could not touch it, but could only negotiate the disposition of it with his friend Fisher, under the strict and significant injunction, "KEEP MY NAME QUIET." Mr. Hoar is

sure there is nothing wrong about this, and Mr. Dawes looks upon it as a "decoration."

Does not all this show that, with a native delicacy more sensitive than that of Mr. Hoar, Mr. Blaine was conscious that this was a transaction in which it was disreputable for him to be known, and which it was improper and wrong for him to meddle with? As much as that we certainly have under his own hand.

Let us go a step farther. The next thing we find is that some arrangement was made for the disposition of this interest in some way or other by Fisher. Mr. Blaine received the \$25,000 he was in search of, but whether it came from the sale of small flyers or the larger flyers, whether the interest was retailed or wholesaled, does not distinctly appear. All we know is that Mr. Blaine received \$25,000 "in trust." He could not *touch* the part, but he touched the money for it. Why in trust? In declarations of trust it may be said to be usual to name the *cestui que trust*. Here is a trust in the clouds. For whom did he hold this money in trust? For himself? For Mr. Jay Cooke, or Mr. R. D. Riee, or Mr. Fisher? Or was it for Mr. Elisha Atkins, in whose name the certificates of the interest in the Northern Pacific were to be issued?

This sale by Blaine, and this trust money receipted for, seem to have been the source of considerable trouble as yet quite unexplained. Less than a year afterwards, on the 24th of October, 1871, Mr. Fisher wrote to Mr. Blaine urging a settlement of the Northern Pacific Railroad account of \$25,000. This letter, or a copy of it, was in the package which Mulligan delivered to Blaine, and was numbered eight in Mulligan's memorandum. This would probably have thrown some light on the matter, but Mr. Blaine did not produce it. He said that it was not in the package. Its absence is much to be regretted and difficult to be explained. In the February following, Mr. Fisher wrote twice to Blaine, telling him he would not receive the share, and demanding a return of the \$25,000. Mr. Blaine wrote him that was impossible. He would deliver the interest, but he would not pay back the money, falling back on his readiness to "*fulfill his memorandum*," or to "*make a further sale of the shares in the Northern Pacific Railroad*." Whether or not Blaine compelled Fisher to accept the specified interest, or Fisher

compelled Blaine to disgorge the money received "in trust," does not appear in the report of the proceedings and the debate in the House of Representatives. From other sources than the debate we learn of the final repayment of this trust money, but this will afford a subject of future consideration.

In the face of these facts, established by public statutes, official documents, and Mr. Blaine's letters, proving beyond a doubt that Mr. Blaine received, or expected to receive, from Jay Cooke or from other representatives of the twenty-four parts, one eighth of one part; that the transaction was of such a nature that he could not appear in it; that the interest was of such a nature that he was obliged to get rid of it promptly for one third of what similar interests were alleged to be selling for, — in the face of all these facts, Mr. William Walter Phelps affects to discredit — what? "*The alleged connection of Mr. Blaine with a share in the Northern Pacific enterprise.*" With an effrontery equal to that of his friend Blaine, he substantially denies that the Speaker ever had, in "any form whatever," the "remotest interest in the Northern Pacific company." That is the idea intended to be conveyed to the public. Is it true, or is it a downright and direct falsehood? I do not answer this question, but I beg of Messrs. Dawes, Long, and Hoar to explain it.

August 30, 1884.

POSTSCRIPT.

In the foregoing letter I have stood upon the bed-rock and hard-pan of statutes and proved documents.

Now, Mr. William Walter Phelps, what becomes of your statement that Mr. Blaine never had the remotest interest in any share in the Northern Pacific Railroad? Had he the "control" of this interest, or was he raising money on false pretenses? I pause for Mr. Phelps's reply.

X.

A BAD ATTACK OF VIPERS, AND THE REMEDY.

Mr. Dawes's Decorations and Mr. Hoar's Panegyrics of Blaine.

THIS chapter I shall devote to a few odds and ends that require to be disposed of, before taking up some more serious questions. I am under some undischarged obligations to Judge Robinson no less than to Senator Dawes, and I am in arrears to Governor Long.

In demonstrating why Mr. Blaine should be elected to the presidency, the most potent reasons exhibited by the Judge, on which I have not yet commented, are to be found in a remarkable string of vituperative epithets applied to the leaders of the Democratic party and the Democratic party itself. It is painful to reflect upon the opinion entertained by the Judge of more than one half the American people. If the popular majority, now indicated by a majority of seventy in the House, should happen to elect a President, it is clear that the Judge must look upon our governmental experiment as a failure. He believes in a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, — but only when a majority of the people are of his way of thinking.

We are told by Judge Robinson that the election of a Democratic President is the election of a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Cabinet. He is wrong so far as the House and Senate are concerned, but he is right in regard to the Cabinet. On this point let us pause a moment. The prominent candidates for Mr. Blaine's Cabinet will be the men who experienced epileptic fits over the plumed helmet at Chicago; and those of them who howled the loudest will stand the best chance. Outside of that ring will be the most prominent of the Star Route thieves. Among them, beyond all question, will be "my dear Dorsey," Stephen W. Dorsey, formerly of Arkansas, and mixed up like Blaine with the swindling land grant railroads in that State. William E. Chandler and Secor Robeson are cronies of Blaine not less conspicuous than Dorsey. I have a letter before me coming from the very highest author-

ity which shows that they would be just the men to help Blaine get rid of the surplus. "The so-called reconstruction of the four monitors," my correspondent writes, "is the *baldest robbery*. Four millions will be wanted to complete the job, and the vessels will be worthless when finished." Vote for Blaine, and you'll get the right man in the navy department to spend your money without giving you any more navy than you have now, after an expenditure of four hundred millions.

Stephen B. Elkins and Benjamin Franklin Jones, the financiers for Blaine, who are engaged in levying illegal contributions on reluctant federal office-holders, and procuring subscribers for a comic newspaper, by which they hope to laugh Blaine into the presidency, — one or the other of them, for they are both millionaires, will probably be Blaine's Secretary of the Treasury, unless that place is already promised to General Butler. Then Brady would be the most eligible man for Postmaster-General, or William Pitt Kellogg, or possibly William H. Kemble, the eminent Pennsylvanian Republican, might be propitiated by a cabinet office, and "stay bought." Mr. Decoration Dawes is rapidly qualifying for a seat among these worthies, by his unremitting efforts by speech and by telegram to debauch the public sentiment of Massachusetts and to lower the standard by which her people have hitherto measured their public men. And if there is any virtue in the grossest flattery and the most vulgar adulation, even George Frisbie Hoar might raise himself to the level of the baser followers of the Plumed Knight, and justly feel that he had entitled himself to a Cabinet appointment from the slanderer of his native Commonwealth.

Now, as far as the public welfare is concerned, would the Commonwealth suffer any detriment if, instead of a ring composed of such materials, we should have such a Cabinet of Democratic statesmen as an honorable and honest public servant like Grover Cleveland would undoubtedly select for us? What great calamity would befall the country if we should see Thomas F. Bayard in the State Department, Samuel J. Randall or Senator Edmunds's friend Allen G. Thurman in the Treasury, Abraham S. Hewitt, William S. Holman, Joseph E. McDonald, William C. Endicott, or Mayor Prince in the other departments? There is only one Robinsonian answer to this:

The Star Route thieves are Republicans — therefore all saints. The statesmen are Democrats — therefore all devils.

Let us consider the Judge's arguments. "Vipers of treason, disloyal, fanatics of free trade, copperheads, repudiation and ruin, curse and terror, black with devotion to slavery, conspirators against liberty, relentless opponents of free ballot and free count, crimes against the ballot box, Southern oligarchy, dark and damning treason, bloody overthrow, fights and hates the civil service, plunder politics, notorious fraud, practices the spoils system, constant conspiracy, constant crime, hypocrisy and depravity, vilest nest of vipers," — et cetera! et cetera!

Hold on a moment. These epithets embody the idea that a man who counts himself as one of one half of the American people entertains of the other half. Is there any reason or good sense in this?

Prescribing for other people is something I do not undertake. But for myself I can say that if I ever have an acute attack of such venomous parts of speech I shall immediately take to my bed and request my friends to telephone for Dr. Holcombe or Dr. Greenleaf, with instructions that I should be bled, blistered, and bled to their heart's content, and even then I should not expect to be out in season to vote at the next presidential election. Nor should I expect to vote at all, except on a favorable return to a writ *de lunatico inquirendo*.

This does not leave me much space for Senator Dawes, but I do not require much for a gentleman who pronounces the unrebuked slanderer of Massachusetts, the official jobber, the self-convicted pawn of his veracity and honor, a "stainless" man, only "decorated" by the proofs of his venality and corruption. Senator Dawes laid himself out at the ratification meeting in Boston. He there advocated Blaine's election because the Republican party had twenty-five years of achievement *behind* it. What do we care for what a party has *behind* it. We want to know what a party has *in* it, *around* it, and *before* it: and when we see prominent *in* it, and engaged in running it, water thieves, land thieves, post-office thieves, jobbers, lobbyists, and corruptionists, what nonsense it is to talk about what is *behind* it, be it a whole century of great achievements!

Then Senator Dawes had a good deal to say about the marvelous manifestation of the irresistible power of political currents

in a nation of fifty millions of freemen. I am quite at a loss to understand how he applies this rather grandiloquent and rhetorical observation. It reads to me like a sentence cut out of one of his sophomore forensics, and rather rubbishy for a sophomore. There is something also about "intense Americanism," and "political currents" figure again as bearing on their "bosom" the "future grandeur or humiliation of the republic." This last I do not comprehend, unless it is an allusion to the Mulligan letters, which Mr. Blaine very properly said he could not read without "humiliation." The "intense Americanism" idea seems to have been quite eliminated from the canvass — as a Republican peculiarity. Our Democratic brethren assert a louder claim to it, and the managers of the Blaine canvass drop it in their solicitude to get up a comic newspaper where it would not cut any figure at all. "The coming struggle for a more pronounced American policy" is merged in the coming struggle on the question whether we shall have an honest man or a jobber for our President. Anything more intensely American than the war with England and the war with Mexico, and the acquisition of Louisiana, the Floridas, and California, can hardly be desirable.

I will not be unjust to the honorable senator. If he is not an orator and a rhetorician he is nothing and nowhere, so I will pick out a plum or two from a pie which Johnnie Horner might have plumed himself upon. "Let us," said Mr. Dawes, "lift the discipline of the campaign to the level of the great issues and stake, and not stop to pick up bird-seed by indifference to the forces which are pushing the republic on to its destiny." Read this, brother farmers, and tell me what on earth the orator means. What idea do you get from "lifting the discipline of the campaign"? Does this refer to the "discipline" that Elkins and Jones are establishing in the matter of the bribery fund among the office-holders at Washington? And the "stake"? Is that the heritage of the office-holders, and the hundred million surplus that Mr. Blaine would continue to raise for the vultures and harpies who fasten on it? "Pick up bird-seed by indifference," — what can this mean? Brother farmers, are you going to take your opinions on the say-so of a man who is capable of stirring up such a muddle of nonsense as this, as an argument to induce thinking men to vote for a jobber like

Blaine? Read the documents. Study them for yourselves. We are just as competent to form a judgment on them as Mr. Dawes. If you think a man is "decorated" by dishonor, vote as Mr. Dawes tells you. If you think a man is "decorated" by obtaining "control" of an interest in a railroad under circumstances in which he cannot touch it, and under circumstances in which he cannot permit his name to appear, and puts off that interest on his friends under circumstances which authorize them to demand and obtain the return of the money,—if you think as Mr. Dawes does, that such a "little transaction in Boston" is a "decoration," by all means vote as Mr. Dawes tells you to vote. If you think a public man "decorated" by taking ten neighbors into his confidence and putting off upon them wildcat railroad securities under circumstances which give those neighbors a "moral claim" upon the broker for a return of the money, vote by all means with the men who are of the same opinion. If you think a man "decorated" by sharp practices, vote for Mr. Blaine. If you think a man "decorated" by venality, vote for Mr. Blaine. If you think a man "decorated" by corruption, vote for Mr. Blaine. Vote as Mr. Dawes and Mr. Hoar tell you to vote. But if you do not think so, and are not prepared to accept the opinions of "our best men," as their friends sometimes call the honorable senators (as if they were any better than we are), in the place of your own judgment and your own convictions, I repeat my injunction: Read the documents and decide for yourselves.

Now for the ex-governor. Lawyer Long read the evidence formerly and entertained a very decided opinion that Mr. Blaine was guilty as charged in the indictment. After Mr. Blaine's nomination at Chicago, Lawyer Long looked over the evidence again and thought the charges were not proven. This result was brought about by what Mr. Blaine would call a "strange revolution of circumstances."

It may be well, brother farmers, to remember, in estimating the value of their advice, that Messrs. Hoar, Dawes, and Long are all lawyers and all office-holders.

September 2.

XI.

A HOST OF LAWYERS RETAINED FOR THE DEFENSE.

The Mulligan Literature and the Northern Pacific.

ANOTHER lawyer in the field, but this time not an office-holder! Another counsel for the defendant on hand, by elaborate sophistry and ingenious diminution to whittle away the presentment of the Grand Inquest of the Nation! To Dawes, Long, Lodge, Hoar, and Robinson we have now to add the name of R. M. Morse, Jr., president of the recent Republican State Convention. Six special attorneys for the man in the dock, but, thank God, I have not yet heard of a single tiller of the soil who has come forward and said to his fellow citizens of Massachusetts that James G. Blaine, as a candidate for the presidency, rises to the standard of her traditions, her character, and her requirements. I have not yet heard one farmer assert that the election of James G. Blaine to the presidency, in the face of admitted and undenied facts, would be otherwise than a great calamity for the American people.

In a previous chapter I have anticipated Mr. Morse's bold statement in regard to Mr. Blaine's "alleged" connection with the North Pacific Railroad. On behalf of his client, Counselor Morse says that the "*only thing*" the Mulligan letters show in regard to the mysterious block of North Pacific is that Mr. Blaine "determined that he could not take it, and that he did not take it." They show no such thing, but they prove distinctly that Mr. Blaine was determined to get \$25,000 for the block, and that he did get it. They show that for some reason or other Fisher was dunning him for two years to refund that \$25,000, whether for a failure of consideration or misrepresentation as to the value of the block does not appear. They show that in some way or other Fisher had got the Plumed Knight in an uncommonly tight place, in this regard, and the correspondence leaves him there, with \$25,000 in his pocket, "in trust" for the Lord knows whom.

The money was paid to Blaine "in trust" in November, 1870. It is stated, but not in the correspondence, that Fisher finally

succeeded in procuring a return of the trust money in the fall of 1872.

In view of all the circumstances, it would, indeed, be strange if the Mulligan letters did not possess the great public interest which Mr. Morse very justly attributes to them. On this point I will give counsel for the defense the benefit of his statement in his own words:—

“ But the assailants of Mr. Blaine fall back upon the ‘Mulligan letters.’ How they revel in those letters! How they print them and reprint them! How they read them and read them over again! Surely no correspondence was ever so carefully studied. These scholars and statesmen forget for the moment the classic letters of Cicero and of Webster, these youths care no more for the love songs of Petrarch to his Laura; all are alike absorbed in constant, steady, and intense perusal of the ‘Mulligan letters.’ Here, it is claimed, is full confession, if not of any specific act of corruption, yet of dishonest purpose or habit of mind. But with all deference to those whose judgment leads them honestly to that conclusion, I deny emphatically that such is the fair and reasonable interpretation of those letters. I cannot undertake here to analyze this correspondence.”

Admitting that this correspondence could not have been judiciously analyzed on this occasion, I think Mr. Morse is entirely right in this view of the Mulligan letters. It shows that Mr. Morse is well aware of what the people are thinking about, and feels that they are in search of the right material for reflection. These letters are read and are carrying reading people to just conclusions in regard to their author. On the other hand, the special campaign literature of the Republicans seems to be quite neglected. The Republican Congressional Committee, for instance, have printed twenty-one campaign pamphlets, eighteen of them trashy speeches or letters of members of Congress on the tariff, which nobody will read, and which the committee are trying to peddle round at from forty cents to a dollar a hundred,—and no buyers. The American people have no apprehension that the country is in any danger from the inability of capital to take care of itself. They know that capital buys up state legislatures, and attorneys, general as well as special, and courts of justice, and government departments, and the cynical and malicious go so far as to say that the members of neither House of Congress are wholly inaccessible to its blandishments.

We all know that with the millionaires and lesser capitalists in the two Houses, and the potent influences that can be brought to bear on the impecunious, there is just about as much chance for the breaking out of the millennium as there is for any encroachment by either party on the real or supposed interests of capital, whether involved in the tariff policy or any other policy. The most that can be done by a Democratic majority is to apply the knife to the cancerous surplus that is corrupting the body politic, and the sooner that is done the better.

Little wonder that there is no market for the long-winded themes and forensics on the tariff, that have been, presumably, written for the members by their clerks, and have been already circulated at the public expense in Congressional Debates. But the Mulligan letters are quite another thing. They always pique and sometimes gratify curiosity. The annals of the world do not exhibit such a collection. It is entirely and absolutely unique. Why should not we forget for the moment the classic letters of Cicero and Webster? To what contemporary Piscator did the great Roman orator ever address himself in a vein so interesting? In what letters of Webster, or of any other American statesman, can we find such labyrinths of occult circumstances, such appeals for mysterious settlements, such disavowals of obviously corrupt interests, such familiarity with "small flyers" and splendid chances" and what the "whole thing could be had for," such intimate knowledge of how lobbies had "things set up," such dunnings for the return of money receipted for "in trust," — such proofs, in short, that the man whom Mr. Phelps represents as so entirely "absorbed in public affairs" as to require a financial guardian was a man who never lost a chance to use his political and official influence for the acquirement of money, from the time he undertook, by methods with which all Pennsylvanian politicians were familiar, to infuse Simon Cameron with an enthusiasm for Spencer rifles down to the moment when he "couched his lance" at the Democratic borders, and landed himself in the convenient asylum of a sun-stroke.

Then there never were letters since the world was made that have produced such different impressions on the same individuals at different periods. Governor Long and Senator Hoar have been for years in the habit of regarding them as very

naughty. Even Senator Dawes for a long time did not consider them as peculiarly "decorative." It is said, indeed, that when Blaine uttered his malicious invective against Massachusetts, though Dawes and Hoar did not say much publicly in rebuke of the slanderer, they did give out in an undertone that it was not much matter what such a man might say against Massachusetts; Massachusetts could stand it. Even partisan editors of the most pronounced Republican stamp entertained no doubt as to the purport and effect of these letters when they were first published. The "New York Tribune," the "Chicago Tribune," the "Cincinnati Commercial," and the "Cincinnati Gazette" considered the letters "dark, stubborn, and destructive facts," not to be "sponged out." The "Cincinnati Gazette" said on the 10th of June, 1876: "No man can successfully stand before the people of the country as the Republican candidate for the presidency, covered all over as Blaine is with his own letters." Now, with Dawes, the "Gazette" considers them decorations. Senator Hoar does not go quite so far. He rather inclines to the opinion that they come under the head of warts or wrinkles.

Mr. Morse suggests that the dudes even have given up the sonnets of Petrarch to his Laura, in exchange for the Mulligan letters. Why not? Is there any comparison in present interest between the sonnets of the Italian to his mistress and the letters of Petrarch Blaine to Laura Fisher? When Petrarch had a "splendid thing," was not it always his "first and best impulse" to offer it to his Laura? If you desire emotional writing, gush of sentiment, depth of pathos, bursts of gratitude, sly allusions, picturesque attitudes, skillful ballooning, pregnant insinuations, — are they not all to be found in that memorable package which Blaine was not "afraid" and was not "ashamed" to show to forty-four millions of his countrymen, though he buttoned it up in his breast pocket as if this "courageous and high-spirited gentleman" was really very much ashamed and very much alarmed?

While I am writing this I receive the "New York Times," containing a letter of Mr. George Bliss, in reply to a letter of mine to Mr. Morse, in regard to his assertions in the matter of the North Pacific, or the "little transaction in Boston" that never became a transaction at all. What Mr. Bliss has to do

with Mr. Morse's correspondence I cannot imagine. He is the *seventh* lawyer who appears as counsel for the defendant in this Massachusetts jurisdiction. Mr. Bliss is the gentleman who received from the surplus an hundred dollars a day for many months, for teaching us how *not* to convict Brady, Dorsey, and Kellogg. He is the same gentleman who suggested to Attorney-General Brewster a consultation with Bill Chandler as to the political effect of the probable testimony of a particular witness before putting him on the stand. If he has as good luck in defending Blaine as he had in convicting Dorsey, perhaps he will be Mr. Brewster's successor.

September 9.

XII.

WHITEWASHING, PAINTING, AND GILDING

BY EMINENT HANDS.

The Bar and the Press.

THESE chapters have been addressed to the farmers of Massachusetts without distinction of party. I have lived long enough to know that in the philosophy of proverbs there is nothing truer than that party is the madness of the many for the elevation, enrichment, and aggrandizement of the few. I believe that the salvation of our institutions rests in the hands of men engaged in the pursuits of agriculture, the men who are always honestly adding something to our wealth and prosperity. From their labor comes by far the largest addition to the created capital of the country. Out of what they raise comes the transportation that gives value to the railroads. Out of what they raise comes the traffic that creates oil kings, and wheat kings, and cotton kings, and pork kings, and the army of buyers and sellers in the marts of commerce and the stock exchanges of our great cities. Out of the earth and the sea comes the surplus.

The tillers of the soil and the toilers on the sea — the farmers, the miners, and the fishermen — produce the hundreds of millions of dollars that are annually raised from the American people by iniquitous taxation. From them comes the one hun-

dred millions of surplus, raised that the morals of the people may be corrupted, and that our presidential election may degenerate into a struggle in which custom-house officers, collectors of internal revenue, postmasters, contractors, jobbers, land thieves and water thieves, and conspicuously Star Route thieves, come to the front, — make the nominations, organize the committees, organize the office-holders, levy unlawful assessments on the timid and reluctant subordinates in public service, and prepare the way for the carnival of spoils and plunder that they look forward to under the auspices of Blaine.

The worst feature in this canvass, said a prominent Republican to me the other day, is the attempt of such men as Dawes and Hoar to make light of the facts proved by the Mulligan letters. "I am a Republican, and shall vote for their candidate," he said, "because I hate the Democrats, not because I love Blaine. I am a party man, and would vote for the Devil if he managed by hook or crook to get the nomination. I will not disgrace myself, however, by saying that these charges decorate Mr. Blaine, or that he is an unspotted candidate, as Dawes and Hoar insist. It does Blaine no good and is calculated to lower the standard of public morals." But my Republican friend did not admit that his own standard of political morals was considerably lowered when he declared that he must draw the line somewhere, and drew it the wrong side of Satan.

One of the most striking circumstances of this canvass is the comparison it inevitably provokes between the honorable independence of the press and the disreputable partisan advocacy of the bar. Before the meeting of the convention, Mr. William Walter Phelps appeared as the volunteer attorney for his client Mr. Blaine. He aspired to do an effective job of whitewashing. He went through every count of the indictment against Mr. Blaine, and claimed to have disposed of them all in his favor. More than an attorney, he assumed to be the nearest friend of the illustrious candidate, and was prepared to vouch not only for all his actions, but for all his thoughts and aspirations. He told Mr. Blaine's story, not as his representative merely, but as himself. He denied, he explained, he asserted, as by authority. Mr. Phelps's defense only confirmed the prevailing opinion of his client's guilt, and that impression was particularly pronounced in the State of Massachusetts. The

delegates to the Republican convention from this State were unanimous in the opinion that the charges were not disproved by Mr. Phelps. They protested that Mr. Phelps had made out no case; that in any event Blaine's record was a doubtful one, and to nominate him for the presidency, even under Mr. Phelps's coat of whitewash, would be to invite inevitable and deserved defeat.

But when our delegates returned from Chicago swearing that Mr. Blaine was too black for any Mr. Phelps to whitewash, they concluded that those of them who were office-holders and those of them who desired to become office-holders — whether for the honors or profits — must stick to the organization and go in strong, even if the nominee *was* Beelzebub. Then they devised the plan of supplementing Mr. Phelps's whitewash with a coat of paint, and, of all people in the world, who should they get but the great moral painter of the Commonwealth to lay it on with a trowel. Senator Hoar contracted to paint out all the "warts and wrinkles," and to make Mr. Blaine (skin-deep) as presentable as any man in the country. He beat all to pieces Senator Frye's dazzling picture of the Plumed Knight couching his lance at poor Mulligan. He painted Blaine in all sorts of scenes and attitudes, omitting always that memorable field in which the Plumed Knight unhorsed two distinguished warriors who wielded the battle-axes of Massachusetts. But the painting, — first in water colors and afterwards in oils, — though it helped the whitewash, was not entirely satisfactory. Something more was called for, and brother Dawes — a most competent artist in that line — was employed to do a job of gilding, and did he not "decorate" his subject? After this whitewashing, painting, and gilding by these three eminent masters, Messrs. Lodge, Long, Morse, Governor Robinson, and George Bliss were brought forward to frame and glass him and exhibit him to a confiding public, in such a style that his most intimate friends, even Fisher and Caldwell, would never know him.

In a former chapter I have alluded to the struggle of the reformers against the office-holders in 1840. This Conservative bolt from the Democratic party corresponded with the Independent bolt from the Republican party in 1884. At that time a considerable number of gentlemen, who held office by popular or by legislative election, separated themselves from the Democratic

party, and opposed its presidential candidate. This was the case especially in Virginia, New York, and Pennsylvania. But the Democratic press at that time followed the lead of the office-holders proper. There was a feeble protest from a journal in the city of New York, started in the interest and through the influence of Senator Tallmadge. There was another journal at Nashville that joined the bolt, and the editor of it had to go about with pistols in his pockets to protect himself against his old political associates and friends. The journals in question bolted before the renomination of Van Buren, and stuck to their bolt, but their circulation was small and their power limited. They were hardly a factor in the contest, which was mainly carried on by speech in the immense popular gatherings that were rallied against the office-holders and the defaulters, while the Republican belters of 1884 have a press in their own party that is of incalculable significance and influence in the fight against the candidate of the office-holders and the Star Route thieves.

It is entirely without precedent in our history, or in the history of any other people, that the leading journals of a party should oppose its candidate for the highest office, on the ground that he had been guilty of making money during his public career by the abuse of his political and official opportunities. When has such a charge been brought against Pitt, or Peel, or Gladstone, or Derby, or Disraeli, or any English minister? What public man of the United States has ever been suspected of such an offense against political morality? The people reluctantly pardoned a single corrupt act in the case of one Republican President, but Lot Morrill spoke with the voice of a prophet when he said in 1880 that the Republican President would be elected that time, "but unless new methods are used in the party and better men become its leaders he will be the last one elected." Its best leaders are falling away from it, — Speed, and Schurz, and Bristow, and Curtis, and Conkling, and Codman, — all opposed to Blaine, and most of them in active opposition, while there come to the rescue Dorsey, Elkins, Clayton, Brady, Kellogg, Bliss, Joyce, Robeson, Keifer, Gould, Field, and the grand old army of office-holding martyrs who have monopolized for twenty years the "small flyers" and "splendid things" in the gift of the Republican organization, and intend to hold them if they can for their natural lives against all comers.

I have alluded to the course of the press in this contest as in honorable contrast to that of the bar on the Massachusetts arena. Among the lawyers retained for the defense of Mr. Blaine I owe an apology to Mr. Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar for hitherto omitting the brother of the senator. There are now eight counselors on the list. It is gratifying to those who know how fastidious he is to find that there is one man in the world for whom the Judge is proud to profess reverence. We agree with him when he says it is impossible to get up a party in this country on the issue whether or not people dislike Mr. Blaine. Gil Blas, and Scapin, and Figaro, and all the pleasant rogues of the Continental novelists and dramatists, — who dislikes them? Who dislikes Dorsey? Dislike is not the word to apply to agreeable, dashing fellows like Blaine, Elkins, and Dorsey. But does not the Judge misrepresent the real issue? Is it the question whether we *like* or *dislike* Mr. Blaine? The question is not whether Blaine is a pleasant fellow, — that we admit, — but is he a man of such antecedents and such associations as ought to win the respect and confidence of the American people, and command their suffrage for the highest office in their gift? That is a very different question. And with due deference to Judge Hoar, I think he does great injustice to himself, as well as to the press, when he utters the somewhat misapplied observation that “this campaign is not to be carried on or influenced to any extent by the ribaldry of scurrilous newspapers.” Nobody is likely to be influenced by ribaldry or scurrility, but the only ribald and scurrilous attack that I have yet noticed in the Massachusetts newspapers was published in a journal supposed to be in the special confidence of Mr. Blaine, and was put in circulation by the Republican state committee under the auspices of Mr. Lodge. It is not the ribald and scurrilous press of the Republican party that opposes Mr. Blaine. It is those journals which have rendered the most efficient service in the Republican cause, which have always been active and prominent in advancing and protecting great public interests, and have uniformly maintained the highest character for ability and integrity.

Take the Republican journals of Massachusetts. A very eminent lawyer for the defense said to me the other day, “The ‘Daily Advertiser’ — yes — an old foggy newspaper that has

not had any influence for forty years." For nearly three fourths of a century it has been a leading journal in New England. Federal at first, National Republican, Whig, and Republican since; honest, able, truthful, and conservative always. Never before has that journal taken a stand against the regular nominee of its party for any office whatever. Is there not a strong significance in the fact that it opposes Mr. Blaine now? If its founder, Nathan Hale, were living to-day, he would say that the "Advertiser" was right, and that his son Edward had better stick to his sermons and novelettes, in which he has acquired deserved distinction, than meddle with politics. I think I can hear that pure and wise man, who exercised so long such decided, indeed almost autoeratic, influence among Boston gentlemen, saying, "Edward, my son, don't write any more about politics in the 'Independent;' you mean well, but you really don't know anything about it." When a gentleman undertakes to give the weight of his name to his opinions, and is not contented to let them pass upon their merits, he should be sure that he knows something of the subject he discusses. Mr. E. E. Hale is too incorrupt himself to understand Blaine and his confederates.

But the "Advertiser" is only one of several leading Republican newspapers in Massachusetts that have never been ribald or scurrilous, and that are ardent in their opposition to Blaine. From the days of Lynde M. Walter, its founder, to the present days, the "Evening Transcript" has been in the same political line with the "Advertiser,"—for many years not so decidedly political, but uniformly working in the interest of sound morals and honest politics. So the Boston "Herald," with its vast circulation and its remarkable political intelligence and ability, and the Springfield "Republican," the great organ of opinion in Western Massachusetts. Can any sensible man fail to understand the meaning and the importance of such a persistent and such an overwhelming revolt in the journals of a great party against the presidential candidate of that party on the ground that he is a corrupt man, and that he has been put forward and is now sustained by corrupt confederates?

So with the New York press. Could anything be more preposterous than the cry that the "Evening Post" is a free trader, and is therefore opposed to the Republican nomination? Two

distinguished natives of Berkshire, William C. Bryant and Theodore Sedgwick, put the "Evening Post" on its free-trade course fifty years ago. It was at that time Democratic, and maintained its position in the Democratic ranks until it became one of the foremost Republican journals of the country. In spite of its inclination to free trade, it has supported from that time to this all the Republican candidates for all offices, and has been a warm advocate in behalf of all the presidential nominees of the party, from Lincoln to Garfield. Did Republicans ever object to the support of the "Post," or fail to recognize its conspicuous position in the Republican ranks, because it entertained theoretical opinions on economical questions that differed from those of Senator Edmunds? Did the "Post" withhold its advocacy from Mr. Edmunds as a presidential candidate, because Mr. Edmunds differed from the "Post" on the tariff question?

Look at the New York "Times." Its founder, Henry J. Raymond, stood godfather at the baptism of the Republican party. He wrote the address issued by its first convention, and the journal he established, in connection with its present editor, has always been the faithful, earnest, and consistent advocate of Republican principles. In every battle that has been fought in its day against corruption, the "Times" has been in the thick of the fray. Wherever the peculators and robbers have shown themselves, in municipal, state, or national directions, the "Times" has pursued them and declared war to the knife against them. It broke up the Tweed ring, and made Tilden's opportunity for him. It exposed the rascalities in the history of the Union Pacific, of which Blaine was the defender, and which led to that oft-repeated exhibition of himself which Senator Edmunds has fixed on a permanent canvas. It seconded Postmaster-General James's movement on the Star Route thieves, and if the prosecution of them under Bliss had been half as efficient as the presentation of their cases by the "Times," they would have been surveying this contest from the loop-holes of a snug retirement, instead of figuring to-day conspicuously in the open as magnates and leaders of the Republican party. So with the independent "Herald," the "Telegram," the "Staats-Zeitung," "Harper's Weekly," "Puck," the "Graphic." Is there not a momentous interest and significance in the fact that all these

Republican and Independent journals are in formidable array against the Republican presidential candidate? Can Judge Hoar or any other judge truthfully say that such journals are ribald and scurrilous, and that the campaign is not to be influenced by them to any extent in comparison with the influence that is to be exercised by the whitewashing, painting, and gilding of Phelps, Dawes, and the Brothers Hoar?

But while I write the papers are put into my hands which show that the warts and wrinkles and the deforming spots have broken out again through all these coats of surface applications, showing through in spite of the whitewash, the paint, the gold, and the varnish. More Mulligan letters, Mr. Morse! More contributions to the literature of jobbery and corruption!

These new letters prove not only that Blaine was himself a first-class liar, but that he tried to make his generous and liberal friend lie for him, and believe that this lying was honorable for both, and consistent with "the most scrupulous integrity." I find, too, some new points in the Northern Pacific business, in which Blaine figures in the Lie Direct, and his friend Phelps in the Lie with Circumstance. Between them they have involved *you*, Mr. Morse, in a disingenuousness which is not creditable, and which I think you owe it to yourself to explain. I may recur to this, for I consider it important.

September 15.

*Published at the VALLEY GLEANER Office, Lee, Berkshire
County, Massachusetts.*

Single copies, post-paid, 8 cents.

\$5.00 a hundred; \$40.00 a thousand.

CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES.

THIRD PART.

BY A BERKSHIRE FARMER.

XIII.

SPECULATING AND JOBBING STATESMEN.

Does a Nomination Change a Candidate whom Massachusetts Citizens have three times rejected?

A REPUBLICAN of Republicans, one who has never joined the Independents, writes me from Boston as follows: "It strikes me that Blaine is knocked 'higher than a kite' by the last batch of Mulligan letters. It can't be necessary to spend much more powder on him." Knowing the writer, and knowing him to be a representative of thousands of citizens in Massachusetts who are not allied to office or office-holders, and who judge of public men and public measures for themselves, I consider this simple expression of opinion from such a quarter a fact of very great significance. If the class of intelligent men of affairs whom he represents come to the same conclusion (and I do not see how it can be otherwise), it is in the power of the Democrats, under the lead of such eminently worthy men as Endicott and Grinnell, to give the electoral vote of Massachusetts to Grover Cleveland. I say that it is in their power — unless they see fit to throw away their suffrages on a personal favorite who stands no possible chance of securing the electoral vote for himself. To this subject I shall revert in a future chapter. Meanwhile, I desire my brother farmers to reflect on this suggestion.

To the moral of this new batch of Mulligan letters, and of all the Mulligan letters now before the people, I propose to devote this chapter, and I desire the farmers of Massachusetts

whom it may reach to ponder well on the facts that it will present for their consideration. It touches a subject of infinite moment, and cannot be dismissed as the outcome of a ribald and scurrilous press. It touches the vice and canker of the times — the greed of gold. It illustrates the monstrous evils that flow from excessive and oppressive taxation, creating the enormous surplus that, in the hands of money-loving, ambitious, and unscrupulous men, is a fund for undermining the virtue of the people, and sapping the corner-stone of the Republic.

It is only in connection with the lesson to be learned from it, and the emphatic warning that it speaks to the American people, that I venture with great reluctance to comment on the humiliation of President Grant. At a comparatively advanced period in his life he was smitten with the speculative avarice that engrossed James G. Blaine from the very commencement of his political career. As far as the people can know, General Grant entered the public service in honorable poverty and left it with a respectable competence. No such stains as disgraced a Marlborough attach to his military history. His hands were clean. He never appeared as a claim agent, for twenty-five per cent. commission, to collect trumped-up bills for railroad corporations to pay them for a service voluntarily and gratuitously proffered. He exercised no underhand personal or official influence in recommending to the war department inventions of speculative partners in the way of "wonderful" rifles, involving wonderful patent fees which we farmers know the like of, in a small way, in the levies of the barbed-wire peddlers and lightning-rod men. Twice, with a large majority of his grateful countrymen, I took an active interest in the elevation of General Grant to the presidency. I had no hesitation whatever in supporting him for a third term against the two men who combined to defeat his nomination, and who had both yielded to the seductions of the tempter. In the face of Blaine's theatrical exhibition of his case in the House of Representatives; in the face of his suppression of facts, his interception of witnesses, his bullying and abuse of the Judiciary Committee, his cringing appeals to Muligan for the letters, the pawning of his word of honor to Muligan and leaving it in pawn, his pretended communication of the contents of the letters to his countrymen, without giving any human being the opportunity of ascertaining whether or not

the communication was honestly made, his indecent charge against the committee in respect to the manufactured telegram of Josiah Caldwell which Mr. Knott was warranted in saying was a "put-up job," his phenomenal lying through the whole matter, — in the face of all this we could not hesitate to prefer the nomination of General Grant for a third term to the nomination of Blaine for a first term.

Up to that time nothing had occurred to shake popular confidence in the sound judgment of General Grant, or to lead the public to suppose that he was greedy of gold, or capable of using any methods of a questionable nature for its acquisition. He afterwards fell into the hands of men who saw money in the use of his name and of his prestige in their speculative operations. He succumbed to the temptation. He posed as the attractive figure-head in Jay Gould's South-Western railroad schemes. Bad led to worse. The plain and honest soldier became an avaricious, money-loving, money-seeking speculator. After having attained the topmost heights of human ambition, after having been for years the first man in the first nation of the world, he fell. Instead of following the example of all his predecessors in the presidency, and enjoying an unostentatious retirement in moderate and honorable circumstances, he began to feel that all his military and civic honors were nothing unless he could supplement them with large material wealth. He thirsted for a fortune that would enable him to compete in show and splendor with the railroad kings, the pork monopolists, the great bankers, the wheat speculators, and the forestallers, engrossers, and regraters of the Mining, Produce, and Stock Exchanges.

He became the slave of a sordid passion for money, and the associate, as it turned out, of swindlers and thieves. The great soldier, the eminent civilian, put up his name and his fame as the valuable banking capital of a plunder shop. The most eminent living man of the nation was used as the decoy duck of sharpers and blacklegs. Not knowingly, — but he was dazzled and hoodwinked by the exhibition of fabulous profits and marvelous accumulations. He thought he was on the highway to boundless wealth when he could borrow on his note of hand \$150,000 of his brother millionaire Mr. Vanderbilt. And the next day he was a beggar, — involved in pecuniary obligations

from which he can never be rescued,—the blind partner and the stolid victim in the most stupendous and audacious frauds that have ever been chronicled in our financial history.

With the knowledge we now possess of the character of General Grant, derived from the notorious financial transactions, or rather the fraudulent operations of the house of Grant, Ward & Co., would intelligent and reflecting men entertain the idea for a moment of reëlecting him to the presidency of the United States? I think not.

The character of James G. Blaine is familiar to us in advance. If we elect him to the presidency we elect a man whom we know to be a rapacious jobber. His love of money; his persistent and inveterate pursuit of it; his implications in all manner of methods for obtaining it; his “small flyers;” his “splendid things;” his “wonderful” rifles; his “very rare chances;” his receipt “in trust” of moneys that were not forthcoming for more than a year after they were imperatively demanded; his “little transactions in Boston” that were not transacted; his extreme solicitude for the “protection of his private correspondence;” his unredeemed honor in the hands of James Mulligan; his “extreme frankness” in communicating nothing whatever in addition to his own letters to avoid “evil surmises, and still more evil inferences;” his “natural desire to make as much as he fairly could” out of the sale of Little Rock bonds to his neighbors substantially at fifty per cent. above the market price; his “botheration” at not being able to obtain a definite and expressed arrangement with Caldwell; his extreme satisfaction for the term of eight years with Fisher’s “unbounded liberality,” contrasted with his inability to bring Caldwell to a “definite proposition;” his “fearful embarrassments” in consequence of Fisher’s “positive cruelty” in the matter of bonds that Blaine purchased only “to the amount of \$30,000,” and on the “same terms as everybody else;” his expressed “endeavor,” when writing to Fisher, to bring his own official usefulness to Caldwell’s attention, “not to be *indelicat* ;” his efforts to secure the bank at Little Rock and the United States arsenal for Fisher and Caldwell as a matter of “favoritism,” and his suggestion that national banks are “very profitable institutions,” thus casting “an anchor to the windward” for subsequent appeals to Fisher’s kindness and generosity and to Caldwell’s undoubted

disposition to treat him handsomely ; his willingness to keep things quiet, to let nobody know that he had ever done anything in Maine, so that Fisher might have no embarrassment in speaking to Caldwell ; his mixing himself up in matters which he " could not touch," and in which his name could not be mentioned ; his placing himself by his use of trust funds in such a position as would permit his correspondent to write him in a mysterious but significant manner, but without rebuke, — " I should judge it was for your *interest* to settle the matter *at once*, and have no further delay ;" his deafness to the frequent importunities for return of trust money till Fisher was compelled to surrender his obligations to the parties in interest ; Fisher's unanswered assertions to him that he had advanced him very large sums of money, for which Blaine had never paid *from his own pocket* one dollar of principal or interest, and had paid him very large sums of money without one dollar of expense to him [Blaine] : ALL THIS, with all that it implies, and much more of the same sort, we know about James G. Blaine *before* the presidential election. Much of this, but not all, we knew as long ago as 1876.

In that year Massachusetts Republicans sent delegates to the National Convention who knew what was then known about Blaine, and who protested that a man with such a record could never receive the support of Massachusetts, and that his nomination would be a fatal and irretrievable mistake, sure to result in deserved disaster and defeat. They returned home and their constituents approved their course.

In 1880 Massachusetts Republicans sent delegates to another convention, in which the same old ring of Blaine men reappeared. They were well disciplined, trained and banded, bent upon getting the candidate of their choice, and hot in pursuit of the " splendid things " that could be evolved from the manipulation of a revenue of \$350,000,000. But the Massachusetts delegates stood firm in their opposition to Blaine. They appealed to his " doubtful record," they brought up the pitiful picture of Blaine " almost on his knees " to Mulligan, and they asked themselves and each other if a man who had ever stood in such an attitude before the American people could be so white-washed and painted as to *appear* worthy to occupy the seat which had been sometime filled by those incorruptible sons of

Massachusetts — John Adams and John Quincy Adams. They asked themselves the question if it were possible for the human imagination to conceive of these great patriots and sages trading on their official opportunities; the subjects of a congressional investigation on *charges* of corruption; and in their fright and shame pawning their honor, without redeeming it, to rescue from public exhibition the damning evidences of their dishonorable traffic. They answered this question to themselves and each other in the negative. They decided that the nomination of such a man could not be sustained in the State, and they compromised on Garfield. A convention of American citizens for the first time in American history submitted to our suffrages for the highest office in their gift a man who had been suspected of jobbery and of lying about it. Never before had any party ventured on such a step. There had been Federal, Democratic, National Republican, Whig, Democratic Republican, Anti-Masonic, Free Soil and Know Nothing conventions, and never before had any statesman been presented by any convention whose name had been associated with a job and a lie. Garfield was the entering wedge. The election of Garfield in 1880 alone made possible the nomination of Blaine in 1884.

When the convention of 1884 came, two previous campaigns had enabled Mr. Blaine to get his "organizing force" thoroughly well in hand. It had been through eight years of discipline and education. He knew, and the country knew, just how many Blaine delegates had been returned to the convention, though I think Senator Hoar stated that he did not believe Blaine knew anything about it. There were none counted from Massachusetts. The Massachusetts delegates went to the convention as determined as ever to oppose Mr. Blaine for the same causes of opposition which governed them in 1876 and 1880. We know the delegates who figured there prominently in his behalf, and we know that they were not of a character to influence the judgment of intelligent and honest men in favor of their candidate. We all remember the scenes that were enacted on that occasion — the theatrical shows of enthusiasm, the transparencies, the banners, the shouting, the music, all the surroundings that money could buy, and that money could have bought for Mr. Edmunds as well as for Mr. Blaine if the friends of Mr. Edmunds could have condescended to use it. The clamor and con-

fusion were never before paralleled in a convention, unless it may have been in a convention of *Sans Culottes* in the Faubourg St. Antoine in the days of the French Revolution. Noise and brass carried the day. Mr. Blaine's tactics prevailed. The money ring and the Star Route thieves dominated the convention completely, and the Massachusetts men were obliged to acquiesce reluctantly in the nomination of the candidate whom they had, in two previous conventions, opposed to the bitter end with the entire approbation of their constituents. Why opposed? On account of his political opinions? No — on account of his corrupt record.

When this campaign opened Mr. B. F. Jones, whom Mr. Blaine appointed to the responsible post of Republican money raiser for the purpose of buying voters, undertook to tell us what the people were going to talk about this fall. He said the issue was to be the tariff. Jones thought an issue was something to be made to order, and that the order would be filled as readily as a call for a hundred barrels of petroleum. William E. Chandler announced at Washington another issue, to be run with the tariff side by side — and that was to keep before the people the confederate brigadiers. The last issue has been experimented on with such moderate success by Judge Robinson and the Hoars that Blaine has determined to confine the fight as far as possible to the tariff and the surplus. He declared this in his somewhat turgid declamation on the result of the Maine election, when he said the speakers and newspapers in Maine had been talking and writing very diligently and exclusively about the tariff. But from the start it was intended that his orators and editors, local or itinerant, should preach nothing but the gospel of money and the gospel of hate, as announced by Jones and Chandler.

Both these issues have been practically eliminated from our canvass. The living issue, the only issue of the slightest importance in this campaign, is the issue on which the Republican delegates from Massachusetts have three times gone into the presidential convention, and three times decided it against Mr. Blaine. And now the men who represented in that convention the hostile sentiments of Massachusetts, as far as they are office-holders or candidates for office, have come out one and all as the panegyrists and eulogists of Mr. Blaine. If we believe them,

for the first time in the history of the world, we have found an angel instead of a man to govern us. Citizens of Massachusetts! There are the records. You can read for yourselves. Read them in the light of the lives of your own good and great men, and do not listen to the infamous doctrine that you must accept a lower standard for the men of to-day. Look on your Adamses and Quineys, your Otises and Sumners, your Brookses and Eustises, your Sullivans and Everetts, your Choates and Websters, your Mortons and Andrewses, your Allens and Newtons, your Winthropes and Endicotts, your Cabots and Parsonsese, your Gores and Sewalls, your Lincolns and Saltonstalls. I could run up the list from scores to hundreds of well-known names, and not one public man of them was ever stained with a job or a lie.

September 20, 1884.

XIV.

HOW BLAINE TOOK HIS MAINE NEIGHBORS INTO HIS CONFIDENCE.

Governor Long's Mud and Miasma.

I HAD intended to devote a chapter to an explanation of the methods by which Mr. Blaine took ten of his neighbors into his confidence, and gave them ten considerable "flyers" in his Little Rock and Fort Smith enterprise, that he has been lying about, and getting other people to lie about, for the last eight years.

With this purpose still in embryo, I find the thing explained in a summary way in one of Mr. Blaine's organs in the city of New York — not the "Sun," but the "Tribune." The latter journal, which now represents a distinguished California millionaire, is much less useful to the Star Route thieves than the sheet which a New York millionaire publishes for his amusement to the dismay of the Democratic party.

The "Tribune" explains the Little Rock business by saying that "He [Blaine] had fallen among sharpers." It was a case of stock-watering on a large scale, and Blaine instead of being an accomplice was a victim. This presents the matter in a new light. Let us see how it will bear examination.

It is generally understood that Jay Gould and the late C. Vanderbilt were the most distinguished stock-waterers that ever figured in this country, but I think this a mistake. These gentlemen watered their stocks after they put them upon the public, but if you want to see a really thorough drenching of a railroad beforehand, a choice specimen of an enterprise that is drowned in the water required to float its securities, you have got to study the contracts and bargains of Sharper Fisher and Broker Blaine. The true inwardness of their transactions in a business point of view has never been thoroughly canvassed. Mr. Schurz's exhaustive study is confined to Mr. Blaine's connection with this matter in its bearing upon the ex-Speaker as a public servant, huckstering his official opportunities of usefulness, for purposes of personal gain. But how do the facts in the case exhibit him as a man of business? Has he manifested good judgment and a disposition to honorable dealing as between himself and Fisher, or as between himself and his neighbors? This is a mine that has not yet to my knowledge been thoroughly explored.

On the 29th of June, 1869, some three or four months after Mr. Blaine's election as Speaker of the House, and after his ruling that was so important to the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad, Mr. Blaine acknowledged a very generous offer from Mr. Fisher to admit him to a participation in the new railroad enterprise. This offer took the form eventually of an arrangement between them of a private nature, by which Mr. Blaine, without the investment of a dollar of his own, was to obtain subscriptions from his friends in Maine for building the road, and secure in compensation a large amount of bonds and cash free of cost. Mr. Blaine was known to his friends and neighbors as a man who had made a great deal of money out of his government contracts, and as enjoying singularly favorable opportunities from his political and official position of procuring "splendid things" for himself, and persons in whom he felt an interest. When, therefore, Mr. Blaine took his neighbors into his confidence, and explained to them that he was able to let them into a railroad enterprise on the same terms as those on which he was going to invest on his own account, they of course jumped at the opportunity, and thought themselves very lucky fellows to enjoy such special intimacy with the speculative

Speaker. A very earnest canvass for subscribers ensued. Probably no man in the country, except perhaps Ward — formerly of Wall and now of Ludlow street — possessed the same faculty as Mr. Blaine of puffing and blowing a “rare chance” of this description, and a considerable number of individuals fell into the trap — ten in a single lot. Their case has been thoroughly discussed in another connection, so I will here take up the transaction with Mr. James M. Hagar, of Richmond, Maine; the more willingly because it has been the subject of a recent explanation by Mr. Hagar himself. The following table from Mr. Blaine’s memorandum book gives the figures of the transaction:

[*Sixth page of memorandum book.*]

2. With James M. Hagar, of Richmond, Mr. Fisher agrees to deliver

		\$6,000 common stock.
		6,000 preferred stock.
		6,000 land-bonds, 7s.
		7,500 first mortgage bonds, 6s.
All for \$9,500, payable —		
\$1,200 }		\$3,000, November 25, 1869.
1,400 }		2,000, December 5, 1869.
900 }		1,500, January 5, 1870.
		600, February 5, 1870.
		600, March 5, 1870.
		600, April 5, 1870.
		600, May 5, 1870.
		600, June 5, 1870.
		<hr/>
		\$9,500

The amounts enclosed on left-hand margin above, viz: \$1,200, \$1,400, \$900, are payable by Mr. Fisher to Mr. Blaine.

Let us consider this transaction as between Blaine and Fisher and then as between Blaine and Mr. Hagar.

It appears, then, that for netting Mr. Fisher \$6,000, Mr. Blaine was to receive \$3,500. That is to say, for every dollar that Mr. Fisher got out of this Maine gentleman, Mr. Blaine pocketed 60 cents. What did Mr. Blaine have to sell Mr. Fisher at such a fiendishly exorbitant rate? Was it what ex-Governor Long styles “push”? Was it because Blaine was a pushing man, with the cheek of a book-agent, and the Gaseon’s

persistence, that would enable him after being kicked out of the door to come in again at the window, that for every dollar Fisher realized from Blaine's friends Blaine was to receive 60 cents? But what else did Fisher give for this \$6,000? He gave Mr. Hagar \$7,500 6 per cent. mortgage bonds; \$6,000 7 per cent. land-grant bonds, and a quantity of stock, common and preferred, that constituted no pressing obligation on the company. The payment of the \$9,500 ran through several months, so that there was a considerable interest account to diminish Mr. Fisher's \$6,000 — but this we will leave out of consideration. For this \$6,000 Fisher, besides the \$3,500 cash paid to Blaine, assumed for the road liabilities to the amount of \$13,500, carrying an annual interest of \$870.

Once more I ask what was it besides cheek and brass that Mr. Blaine had to sell Fisher at this enormous price? Well, there was something to be paid for magnetism — something handsome on this account. But deduct the magnetism money and how much of the residue of this extraordinary "commission" is to be set down to Mr. Blaine's marketing of his official position, the confidence it inspired in his ability to command wonderful opportunities, rare chances, and splendid things? Was it not his official *prestige* that Fisher bought and paid for? Was it not the Speaker of the House that he used as the decoy duck in this business? Did he think that James G. Blaine personally, with his Spencer rifle, would bring down this game in a still hunt? Look at it with what charity we may, was it not the speakership of the House of Representatives of the United States that enabled Mr. Blaine to extort such obviously ruinous terms from this desperately needy enterprise? What wonder that Fisher was ruined, and that the enterprise shortly came to grief. What else could Blaine have expected?

Leaving this view of the case for the present, and assuming that it was a proof of Mr. Blaine's smartness that he was able to drive such an extraordinary bargain with Fisher as to receive 60 cents for every dollar that he paid into Fisher's exchequer, how was it with his Maine friends? How was it with Mr. Hagar? If Mr. Blaine knew anything, he must have known that the attempt to build a railroad by paying \$3,500 cash and issuing interest-bearing bonds for \$13,500 to raise \$6,000, out of which Fisher was to take toll before it got into the enterprise,

— he knew that such an attempt could only end in early disaster and bankruptcy. Indeed, the raising of money on such terms was an admission and a demonstration of insolvency if not of dishonesty. Whatever faith he may have had in Fisher's railroad, he knew that it could not but be an extra-hazardous risk for any man to put his money in it. Test it in this way. Suppose he had told Mr. Hagar that of the \$9,500 paid by him for his batch of securities he (Blaine) was to receive \$3,500 for roping him (Hagar) into the operation. Would Hagar have parted with his money? When he told Hagar that this was a "great chance," the knowledge of which he had acquired in the Speaker's chair, and the "control" of which he had acquired by his familiarity with Boston capitalists who recognized his ability to be "useful to them in various channels," and therefore gave him preferences in the acquisition of their securities which he was anxious to share with his constituents, — when Blaine told Hagar this, admit it was all true except so far as it led Hagar to believe that Blaine was putting his own money into this "splendid thing" on the same terms. When Blaine took Hagar's money he knew that the Little Rock Railroad would default on its very first coupons unless it could raise money to pay its interest by the issue of new bonds negotiated on the same cut-throat conditions as those on which he was negotiating these very bonds. Suppose he had "told the truth" to Hagar at that time. But you say he was trying to make money out of Hagar and could not be expected to tell the truth.

I insist that the relation in which Blaine stood to Hagar at that time was one which called on Blaine's part for what lawyers for the defense would style rightly enough *uberrima fides*, that is to say, the fairest and most conscientious dealing — entire good faith. Hagar was his neighbor. Hagar was his constituent. Hagar was his political friend. Hagar confided in Blaine's familiarity with the Boston capitalists, and his ability to get "splendid things" and great bargains out of them. He understood why and wherefore Blaine was an important man for them, and the consideration for which he was to command such opportunities. Those were the circumstances under which Blaine approached Hagar, and magnetized \$9,500 out of him, \$3,500 of which he put into his own pocket. Hagar was a man

of business. He understood the value of money. Would he not know that a man who was paying Blaine \$3,500 cash and \$13,500 in his own bonds, beside \$12,000 in the *stock* of the road, to raise \$6,000, was only looking forward to inevitable and scandalous bankruptcy?

Hagar came to the conclusion very naturally, when the road failed on its first coupons, that it was a fraud. He told Blaine so when he met him in Washington a year or two after the collapse of the road. Mr. Hagar wrote recently to a friend in New York: "My opinion was *firmly* expressed to Blaine that the securities had no value and the road was a fraud." Mr. Blaine replied that the securities had a value and, with time and patience, all would end well. Mr. Hagar was not to be bluffed off in this way. Mr. Hagar recalled "*the circumstances under which they were taken*," — the material circumstance of Mr. Blaine's 60 cents for a dollar commission not being at that time known to Mr. Hagar. Blaine admitted the "circumstances," and promised to refund on his return to Augusta. Mr. Hagar on his return home made a statement of the transaction in writing and sent it to Mr. Blaine in Washington. On his return to Augusta Mr. Blaine paid the money and received back the securities.

Does this restitution change the character of the original transaction? Was it not on account of the "circumstances" of the original transaction that Mr. Hagar based his appeal to Mr. Blaine when he met him in Washington? Was the enormous commission paid to Blaine any the less the price of Mr. Blaine's official position and its *prestige* because Blaine, when the explosion took place and exposure was imminent, thought it best to repay the money, under the idea, as Mr. Phelps puts it, that the victim had a "moral claim" upon him to be made whole? And Mr. Blaine suffered no detriment. Of the \$19,500 to be made good with interest he already had \$3,500 in his own pocket as commissions. He was able to place all his bonds at good prices with the several subsidized railroads that had business before Congress, and was thus amply put in funds to reimburse, without a dollar's loss to himself, the loss which Mr. Hagar had sustained by his over-confidence in his magnetic and magnificent friend.

Now what can "our best men" say to all this? What can

the eight or ten lawyers for the defense, from Dawes to Morse, say of this sale of official *prestige* in this single transaction? — for it was the Speakership and nothing else that Blaine was trailing in the “mud and miasma” of this sordid and disgraceful brokerage.

Come, Mr. Wellington Smith, you have volunteered to give your respectable name as a voucher for this corrupt politician, and you have appealed to your fellow-citizens in print to offset the declamations of what you call our “best men” against the facts that I am submitting to their careful consideration. Will you tell the farmers of Becket and Tyringham, of Otis and Washington, of Monterey and Great Barrington, that a man who has sold the *prestige* of the Speaker’s chair at a price only limited by the utmost farthing that “insatiate greediness” could venture to extort from a “liberal” and “generous friend” is a fit man to receive their vote for the first office in the gift of a great nation?

Imagine yourself in Mr. Hagar’s place, or Mr. Fisher’s place for the time, and answer that question.

October 3.

XV.

THE HISTORIC JUDGMENTS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Shall Massachusetts basely reverse them?

BEFORE touching the subject of this chapter, bear with me a moment for one word of personal explanation. I am told that a lawyer in good repute — the defenders of Blaine are all lawyers — paid his respects, the other evening at a public meeting in Lee, to the Berkshire Farmer.

He made three charges against me. The first was that week after week I am filling the “Gleaner” with lies against *his* candidate. The chapters are all in print. If Judge Branning will point out anything in them that is untrue or intended to deceive or mislead anybody, then the “Gleaner” may publish his exposure at my expense. This is a grave charge, and I demand the proofs or a retraction. Produce the proofs, Judge.

The second allegation was that I am a pretty sort of a farmer

because I don't farm in winter. On my farm we get in all the crops in the summer and fall. There is no ploughing or harvesting done there with three feet of snow on the ground. If the Judge wants to know whether I am a farmer or not, and knows where to find me, let him apologize for his charges and drop in some day and I'll show him around. He shall see fields that a few years ago were covered with hardbacks as high as his head, that have borne this year good crops of clover and timothy or of potatoes and corn. He shall see a herd of as good-looking and well-bred cows as are to be found in Berkshire, all raised on the farm, and most of them born there. He shall see a good lot of horses, born and raised there; and my foreman will explain to him why it is that we don't raise our crops in winter.

There are some farmers who raise their crops all the year round, but they are farmers of the revenue and not of the soil. Their mills are going night and day. They sow and reap summer and winter; with them it is always seed-time and always harvest. These are the office-holders, the custom-house squads, the Star Route thieves, the monopolists, the governing class generally, who are so anxious to protect themselves in the disbursement of the \$350,000,000 that are annually levied on the American people, and to the enormous excess of one hundred millions over and above the most lavish and corrupt expenditures. No — I don't farm in winter.

The third charge is that I am a free-trader. The Judge cannot sustain that charge by anything he finds in the chapters. I am just such a free-trader as Hamilton was, and Clay and Webster, and the Careys. I am just such a free-trader as Judge Hoar is, but I believe there is no warrant in the Constitution for raising from the people by any manner or form of taxation a surplus for distribution among the States. History teaches us that in all ages the governing class have exhausted their ingenuity in extracting from the people the last farthing that was to be got from them; and never in any kingdom or empire did the most rapacious office-holding robbers of the people extort from them more than was necessary to support the office-holders in luxury, and find their friends in rich jobs and profitable contracts. The Surplus is an enormity reserved for a Democratic republic in the nineteenth century.

Once or twice in the course of these chapters I have alluded to Blaine's attack on Massachusetts, on the floor of the Senate of the United States, and have remarked upon the course pursued by the honorable Senators from the Bay State on that occasion. In these remarks I have unwittingly done injustice to Senator Hoar. He said more than I thought he did, but it is not strange that I should fail to remember what he has himself so strangely forgotten. When he told us what his original opinion was on the Mulligan letters had he not forgotten what he said on the floor of the Senate?

The subject deserves more elaborate treatment than I have yet given it, and I propose to devote this chapter to its consideration. I respectfully ask the attention, not only of the farmers of the Commonwealth, but of all its citizens, be they Prohibitionists, Republicans, Democrats, Butlerites, or Independents, to the extraordinary circumstances of that attack, and to the humiliation to which Massachusetts must submit if she aids in the elevation of Blaine to the presidency.

On this subject I feel deeply. I love the State of my nativity. Born in what was then a fishing hamlet on one of her capes, within a hundred yards of the salt water, and inhaling in my childhood its invigorating breezes, I have a lively recollection of the days when the gallant population of that exposed hamlet rallied to the drum-beat that told of a British cruiser in the offing, and there was not a traitor or coward in the whole crowd. I remember the shouting, the bell-ringing and the illumination that followed the proclamation of peace. In my old age I find among the hills of Berkshire a home that is as dear to me as the sea-coast home of my childhood; and I protest with all sincerity and earnestness that I believe our people are now going through a struggle by far more important to them than our war with England was, and the results of which, for good or for evil, will have a far more lasting and important influence on our character and our destiny as a nation. Time heals the wounds of war. The fields devastated, the harvests destroyed, the smoking ruins and the multitudinous graves, in a few years peace and nature cover with their charitable mantle.

But let it once be established by the votes of the Nation that proofs of shameless and persistent jobbery, and proofs piled

mountain high of shameless and persistent lying about it, are no bar to the advancement of a public man; that partisans and office-holders may laugh and jest about these proofs as "spent rockets" — mere warts and wrinkles on a countenance that they only beautify — mere evidences of energy and push — absolute "decorations;" that our nominations are to be made by money; that our elections are to be carried by bribery; that our offices are to be sold in open market to men who will raise the largest sum in Wall Street to pay for them, as the French mission was sold under Garfield, — let it be understood that the HISTORIC JUDGMENTS of great states on these facts will be set aside in favor of the culprit, if he can secure by any means a nomination to the presidency, and the whole system of Republican government becomes a failure and a fraud.

On the 22d of January, 1878, Senator Hamlin, of Maine, submitted a resolution in the Senate of the United States presenting the thanks of Congress to the people of Maine for the gift of the statue of William King, the first governor of that state, to be placed in one of the halls of the Capitol. Mr. Hamlin prefaced the offer of his resolution with appropriate remarks, and was followed by his colleague, Mr. Blaine. The latter gentleman had given the Senators from Massachusetts twenty-four hours' notice of his intention to offer such observations in regard to the State they represented as would make it desirable for them to be in their seats. His speech was not made on a sudden impulse, excited by the collisions and ardors of debate. It was carefully premeditated, conned over, and no doubt written out beforehand. His intention was to insult the Senators from Massachusetts, and, as far as he was capable of doing it, to insult Massachusetts herself. He went into the Senate Chamber with his Spencer rifle loaded and primed, and had warned Mr. Hoar and Mr. Dawes that they must look for hot shot.

It was for his conduct on this occasion, I presume, that Mr. Hoar bestowed upon Mr. Blaine the title of a "courageous and high-spirited gentleman." He began by a eulogy on Mr. King that was made the excuse for the attack on Massachusetts. Maine was originally a part of Massachusetts, and known as the district of Maine. The people of the district found the journey to the seat of government inconvenient, and the geographical position of the district made an independent condition desirable.

There were some differences of political opinion between the people of Maine and the people of Massachusetts, just as there were between the county of Suffolk and the county of Berkshire — no more, no less. But Mr. Blaine starts off with the allegation that the connection with Massachusetts had become exceedingly “distasteful,” indeed quite “intolerable” to a majority of the people of Maine. “This dislike,” he adds, “was strongly inflamed by the war of 1812, and the resulting political differences.” A majority of the people of Massachusetts were opposed to the war, and a majority in the district of Maine supported the administration of Mr. Madison. The people of the two sections came from the same stock, but in the course of four or five generations of descent their relative characters, according to Mr. Blaine, had entirely changed. The circumstances of frontier life had developed in Maine “a bluff, hearty, brave and generous people,” who, in respect to bravery and generosity, were of course entirely different from the people of Massachusetts, and were “never understood or appreciated in Boston, then as now the governing power in Massachusetts.” It is to these intrinsic differences of character as well as of political opinion that Mr. Blaine attributes the disposition of Maine to establish a separate Commonwealth, which was advocated warmly by Mr. King and opposed, we are given to understand, by the people of Massachusetts. The separation took place. Here Mr. Blaine comes in with a venomous attack, not on the leaders of the Federal party, not on the Federal party itself, which was then in the majority and shaped the policy of the Commonwealth, but on the PEOPLE of Massachusetts. He says that the people of Maine were indebted for their success in accomplishing this result, “*not* to the justice of their cause and the righteousness of their prayer, nor even to a liberal sense of fair dealing on the part of the people of Massachusetts, but *solely* to the fear in the minds of the governing political party that their ascendancy would be endangered if Maine should continue to be an integral portion of the State.” That is to say, the PEOPLE of Massachusetts were insensible to the demands of justice, they were insensible to the demands of righteousness, they were insensible to the demands of fair dealing. They were actuated only by a blind obedience to political leaders to pursue a systematic course of conduct toward Maine that was unfair,

unjust, and unrighteous. This is a foul slander on the dead, and the motive that inspired it was a bitter hatred of the living, — but for that part of the story we shall be indebted to Senator Hoar.

Mr. Dawes first rose to reply, expressing regret that the virtues of Mr. King could not have been spread upon the records of the Senate without attempting to rake open the embers of an already expired and buried political animosity. Not to mar the proprieties of the occasion, by resenting with becoming indignation the charge against the State he represented, Mr. Dawes contented himself with protesting in the name of Massachusetts against the impression that Mr. Blaine's history of her connection with Maine was a true history. While every man in the galleries and on the floor of the Senate was looking for an excoriation of the Senator from Maine Mr. Dawes subsided to the level of a protest, not in his own name, but in the name of Massachusetts. The Commonwealth is obliged to him for doing even so little as that.

I will do Mr. Hoar the justice to say that he manifested to some extent a decided but well-restrained anger. He hesitated from apprehension that it might not have been in good taste to deliver himself of his sentiments on such an occasion. He said in substance that the old Puritan spirit of intolerance had never resulted in such an exhibition of envy, malice, and all uncharitableness as had been that day witnessed on the floor of the Senate. I now quote from the "Congressional Record": "I regret that the Senator from Maine should have been so disturbed by some recent *historic judgments* of the people of Massachusetts, that he should require their ancestors to bear the burden not only of their own sins, but of their descendants'."

Mr. Blaine replied to the effect that everything he had said was true; but he said nothing as to the alleged cause of his disturbance. Then Mr. Dawes interjected an inquiry as to when and where Massachusetts, as a state, had ever made an unpatriotic record.

"I will tell you," rejoined Mr. Blaine, "now and here: Massachusetts refused to pass a resolution thanking one of her own naval officers for a victory. I can give more and graver instances till the sun sets, and for a senator from Massachusetts to rise here and pretend that HIS STATE DID NOT BRISTLE ALL

OVER WITH UNPATRIOTIC RECORDS, going clear up to the verge of treason, and, in the opinion of *patriots* of that day, stepping one point beyond it, is a degree of bravery which it would have been well to show in the war and not reserved to this day."

Here are two charges brought by this false braggart against your fathers, men of Massachusetts. The first is treason; the second is cowardice; and one is just as true as the other. I ask the Brothers Hoar, who have appealed in their electioneering fervor to the memory of their father, was SAMUEL HOAR a traitor and a coward? But it was at Samuel Hoar and men of the same way of thinking seventy years ago, that this shaft was aimed. If ever man lived who was brave and patriotic, — an exemplar of what Roman virtue and Roman valor were in the best days of Rome, — that man was JOSIAH QUINCY, the very head and front of Massachusetts offending in the excited times to which Mr. Blaine referred. Will you desecrate *his* memory by indorsing the slanders of his deliberate defamer? Were the Otises, the Kirklands, the Perkinses, the Lymans, the Shaws, the Sturgises, the Parsonsese, the Lees, the Parkers, the Higginsons, the Pickerings, the Cabots, cowards and traitors? I pause on that word Cabot. Strike it out from your name, Mr. Lodge, if you have not the manhood to feel and resent this infamous attack on the memories of the men who honored it.

"Massachusetts," Mr. Blaine continued, "refused to let her soldiers march beyond the boundaries of their own State. There is another record for you." So far was that from being true, it is the fact that for the invasion of Canada in the second campaign of 1814, Massachusetts furnished more men than any other State in the Union. Thus is another lie nailed to the counter.

Dawdling with the impertinent upstart, Mr. Dawes made allusion to the generosity of Massachusetts towards Maine, in assigning to her the claim against the United States for expenses incurred in the war of 1812.

Mr. Blaine refused to recognize this generosity, but made it the subject of a new assault on the character of the people of Massachusetts. He said that she only assigned away a claim that she did not believe she could get; but as soon as she found that Maine had got the money she turned around very wisely and said, "If we had known this we never should have passed

the vote." When did she turn round and say this? and what warrant had Mr. Blaine for casting this slur on the people of this State?

But not to go through with all that is offensive and irritating in this invective, I will cite but a single passage further. Mr. Blaine had charged Mr. Hoar with being prepared to do anything to bring about a reconciliation between the two sections of the country. If Mr. Hoar was so prepared in 1878 it is a great pity that this disposition had not survived to 1884. One sees very little tendency towards such preparation in Mr. Hoar's speeches during the present canvass. He has been going backwards since the earlier period. But even on that occasion Mr. Hoar emphatically declared that there were several things he could not do even to accomplish a result so desirable as that of reconciliation. Mr. Hoar charged that the Ku-Klux legislation of Congress had passed the House of Representatives, *against "the plottings from the Speaker's chair;"* and averred that he never would have made such a speech as Mr. Blaine had made that day to accomplish any political result whatever. He declared that the smiles and the applause Blaine expected to get from certain quarters in consequence of his attack on Massachusetts would come from men who entertained no feeling against her on account of the war of 1812, but who hated her for her loyalty to freedom, and for her earnest desire to secure the "HONEST AND PURE ADMINISTRATION OF THIS GOVERNMENT."

Here I can pause, for it is hardly necessary even to allude to Mr. Blaine's apprehension that the debate "might *drivel off*" into the ludicrous and funny," — if "Mr. Dawes should have an opportunity to state some other facts." What is this, Mr. Dawes? Is it "bird-seed," or is it "decorations?" What a forgiving Christian Mr. Dawes must be to go in so strongly for a gentleman who has spoken in this fashion of a senator from Massachusetts! Drivelling, forsooth! In what terms could Mr. Blaine have formulated his contempt if after this he had heard Senator Dawes's ratification speech, and read his "spotless" telegrams? The Senator might have turned his other cheek to be smitten on his own account, — but for Massachusetts! Good heavens — that *was* piling on the agony.

Here we have the whole case before us; Blaine charging

the people of Massachusetts with treason and cowardice—Mr. Dawes protesting in a “bird-seed” and “decorative” fashion—and Senator Hoar hurling in the teeth of the slanderer that it was on account of the HISTORIC JUDGMENTS of Massachusetts, and her desire for “an honest and pure administration of the government,” that Blaine had made her the subject of his virulent invectives.

And what were the Historic Judgments referred to? Clearly no other judgments than those which had been passed by the people of Massachusetts on the transactions, little and large, revealed in the Mulligan letters, and on Mr. Blaine’s robust lying about them on the floor of the House. These are the *very* judgments, are they not, Mr. Hoar? Are these Judgments “spent rockets,” Governor Robinson? Their opinions on these matters the people had put into judgments, and those judgments had become historic in 1878. We have Senator Hoar’s word for it. The world knows what those judgments were. If the world had any reason to doubt as to the Historic Judgments referred to by Mr. Hoar at that time, all doubt would be removed by the perusal of a paragraph we copied from the home organ of Representative Rice and Senator Hoar, no longer ago than the 17th of April, 1884:—

[From the Worcester Spy.]

They forget the lamentable disclosures of the early days of June, 1876, when Mr. Blaine was brought to bay and made a splendid, audacious, but sadly unsatisfactory defense. Or, if they remember, it is but vaguely, forgetting how specific and terribly conclusive the evidence was, in the lack of any satisfactory explanation or denial. They forget that it then appeared from his own letters, whose authenticity was not questioned, that Mr. Blaine, while Speaker of the House, wrote to managers of a railroad company, dependent for its value upon the legislation of Congress, asking to be admitted on favorable terms to a share in their enterprise, and assuring them that he would not be a “dead-head”; that some time after he wrote again, on the same subject, renewing his request, and assigning substantially the same reasons why he ought to receive the favor, and adding an account of a service he had done to their road by ruling, as Speaker, while a bill affecting its value was pending; thus distinctly inviting a reward for an official act which benefited a private corporation, conduct not morally distinguishable from bribery. They forget that this

is only one of several equally unpleasant disclosures made by the letters and other evidence produced before the committee investigating Mr. Blaine's conduct, none of which he ever explained. He is ingenious and plausible, and could doubtless make an explanation that would satisfy those who wished to be satisfied — if such an explanation were possible to anybody.

Does not the above paragraph betray all the ear-marks of Senator Hoar? Can any man doubt that it was written, dictated, or inspired by him? And is not this just what George Frisbie Hoar intended when he replied on that memorable occasion to James Gillespie Blaine?

And if all this is so, and these Historic Judgments have been three times pronounced and three times entered up by the people of Massachusetts, do the people of Massachusetts intend now to be beaten on the execution?

Having three times rejected Mr. Blaine in convention, for the reason that they could not look to him for a pure and honest administration of the government, — and that reason truly and distinctly assigned by one of their own Senators in the Capitol of the United States, — how base and contemptible it would be in the people of Massachusetts to go back upon a record which they can neither recall nor deny, and which must stand forever as a monument to their honor or their shame! How base in them to kiss the rod that scourged them; to cringe and fawn as their Senators have cringed and fawned at the feet of this corrupt jobber, this chronic and unremitting liar, this slanderer of their illustrious and patriotic fathers! From the abject humiliation which such a reversal of their Historic Judgments and the historic reason for those judgments would fasten upon her — may God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!

October 11.

FROM HARPER'S WEEKLY.



THE PRACTICAL AGE.

OLD LADY. "He wants ter know ef he ken sell us the Life of J. G. Blaine."

OLD FARMER. "By lightnin', no! he can't sell us with any sech thing. I looked it over yesterday, down to Neighbor Jones's, an' there wa'n't no 'count of that rock business, no 'count of how them Mulligans was lost, nothin' 'bout them Percific bombs, nor any o' them things wots made his reputashun."

BOOK AGENT. "Reckon this is the Berkshire farmer."

[Published at the VALLEY GLEANER Office, Lee, Berkshire Co., Mass. 8 cents single copies, including postage.
\$5.00 an hundred copies; \$40.00 a thousand. Orders executed immediately.]

CHAPTERS FOR THE TIMES.

FOURTH PART.

BY A BERKSHIRE FARMER.

XVI.

THE PRESIDENCY IN 1888.

The New Ticket and the Administration.

THE letter of James G. Blaine to John Sergeant Wise congratulating him on his nomination as Mahone's candidate for the governorship of Virginia is not to be dismissed as a mere idle compliment to a prominent party man. It means something more, and emphatically means that Mr. Blaine does not intend to be dropped out of the presidential canvass of 1888 by failing to show at every convenient opportunity that he still lives. The canvass began somewhat early, not to say prematurely, on both sides. It may be said to have opened when Mr. Blaine announced its issues to his friends and neighbors at Augusta, on first becoming sensible of his defeat. His speech on that occasion was designed to manifest that though defeated he was stronger than his party, and was the proper person for the opposition to rally upon as their leader and prospective candidate. It was in a tone calculated if not intended to warn off all Republican competitors. And there was good reason for his boasting. His canvass had been a marvelous one. None but an uncommonly strong and plucky man could have stood up under the storm of contumely that raged so furiously against him all last summer. That he should have been able to hold his friends together in the face of it was a wonder, but that he should have captured ex-Secretary Evarts, John Sherman and two lineal descendants of Roger, not one of whom loved him, and made them his lieutenants in three of the most important States of the Union, is alone sufficient to prove his skill and power as a po-

litical leader. Without Judge Hoar's club of one hundred and fifty Boston gentlemen, and the brilliant political literature of Senator Hoar which Mr. Blaine complimented so highly at Worcester, Massachusetts might have given her electoral vote to Cleveland. If Mr. Evarts and Mr. Sherman had declined to give Mr. Blaine a certificate of character, scores and hundreds of good Republicans who allow other people to do their thinking for them would have stayed away from the polls, in New York and in Ohio. These certificates survive the defeat, and it will not do for the lieutenants to act on the idea that the commander-in-chief is under ground just yet.

Of the gentlemen to whom I have referred, Mr. Evarts is perhaps the most distinguished, and if we may credit our own Dawes, the whole State of New York was "wild with delight" "that she had strength given her" to make him a senator of the United States. Since this event took place, Mr. Evarts has eaten a number of good dinners—not more than usual—for as Lord Stowell ate always three hundred and sixty-five good dinners every year, and how many more his brother, the famous Chancellor, could not tell—so our great advocate dines numerous always, and dined with more than his ordinary energy about the time to which we have alluded. He was honored with a reception by the Republicans, Independents, Democrats and Mugwumps of Yale College, and a reception by the Lotos Club of New York, and an entertainment by the Fort Orange Club of Albany; and on all of these occasions and some others, he made speeches more or less notable for what he said on the political situation, and much more notable perhaps for what he did not say. One of his most remarkable utterances at this period of "wild delight" was vouchsafed at a dinner of the Middlesex Club, where he was a special guest, when they celebrated at Young's tavern in Boston the anniversary of the battle of Lexington. The rebellion of 1775 recalled the rebellion of State rights men in 1861, and the rebellion of the Mugwumps in 1884; leading up naturally enough to the "rapacious combination now in the possession of power." It was time, in his judgment, that something should be done. Talking would not accomplish anything; they must all be up and doing. He knew what the Republicans of New York were going to do about it, and if Massachusetts did not intend to do something,

New York would do it without her. Something was to be done with "banners and trumpets;" precisely what, Mr. Evarts did not state. But the Republican party out of the offices, he said, were fishes out of water; and one thing to be done, it may be surmised, was to get them back into the water again. The biggest fish of the whole shoal was in his mind all the time, but oddly enough he never said Blaine from the beginning of his speech to the end of it.

There is a great difference in the oratorical methods of Mr. Blaine and Mr. Evarts. When Mr. Blaine has anything to say he says it, and you cannot fail to understand what he means. When Mr. Blaine wants the people's votes, he tells the people he wants them, and tells them too that it is for their interest to give them to him. When Mr. Evarts wants the Middlesex Club to understand that there is great "determination," "sentiment," "interest," "I must say enthusiasm in New York," following if not growing out of his election as senator, which makes the Republicans unanimous in their intention to do something, he leaves the Club to guess what it is the Republicans propose to do.

Now if, as we surmise, the thing for them to do is to make the object of their enthusiasm a presidential candidate, the omission of any allusion to Mr. Blaine in Mr. Evarts's speech is readily accounted for. The Republicans might do a worse thing than to nominate Mr. Evarts. Indeed, I am not sure that they could do a better thing. He is not a bigot in any of his convictions. He can accommodate himself with wise facility to any good thing going, that is likely to be uppermost. He is not only always ready to drink the good wine of other people, but he has a cellar full of his own that he dispenses with a liberal hospitality. At a public dinner he is always an amusing speaker, and (when he chooses to be) is reasonably intelligible. The members of the Union Club, the University Club, and the Union League of New York would go for him to a man, without distinction of party. He is a better scholar than Logan, a better statesman, and in spite of Logan's large collection in biblical literature, I have no doubt that Evarts is the better theologian. Mr. Evarts is a husbandman, moreover, and on his Vermont farm of a thousand acres raises sheep and cattle for the Boston market. He was an old time Whig too, of the Clay and Webster stamp,

and I cannot but remember the courage and independence with which he came to the front at the great Castle Garden meeting in 1850, and did his best to strengthen the hands of President Fillmore's administration in regard to the compromise measures. I shall certainly vote for giving Evarts the Republican nomination.

Let us pass to the next. I have seen some extracts from the Ohio papers recently, referring to Mr. John Sherman in connection with the presidency. The purport of them was, as well as I recollect, that Mr. Sherman was willing to serve his country, even at the expense of his personal convenience, in the presidency.

Meanwhile, however, he goes for a "fruitful system of taxes," war on the rebel Brigadiers, a Republican senator from Ohio, and everything that Blaine goes for, except the Old Ticket.

To this he is as much opposed as General Logan himself.

We have witnessed in the leafy month of June two quite remarkable electioneering tours. The Vice-President *in esse*, and he who last year was the Vice-President *in posse*, have been airing their vocabularies in New England. Mr. Hendricks was invited some time since to deliver an address before the law school of Yale College, and complied with it by the composition of a studied panegyric on the Supreme Court of the United States. How far a good Democrat could go in eulogizing a tribunal that has rendered the recent remarkable decision in the Legal Tender Case, it is difficult to say. When the Court permitted itself to talk about the sovereignty inherent in the United States as a nation, it used language that is not to be found, I apprehend, in the "Federalist," or in any opinion of the Court in the days of Marshall, Story and Taney. But this is aside from the object of this chapter.

Mr. Hendricks left Yale College without being made a Doctor of Laws, and hurried to Harvard, where he was hospitably entertained and listened to in his after-dinner observations with reasonable respect. The Western papers made the most of these honors, and the impression prevails widely in Indiana that the Democrats of New England sympathize with Mr. Hendricks's idea that the mistake of putting him at the tail of the Democratic ticket and not at the head is one that they will rectify the very next time with an enthusiasm of "wild delight."

The drift of his speech at the dinner given him by the Bay State Club at the Parker House was in this direction. He then gave in considerable detail his notions on civil service reform, with the view of showing wherein he differed from the present administration, and succeeded in emblemizing this by the figure of a Hickory Broom, with an intimation to his hearers that this is the sign in which they are to conquer. He expected to have no *personal* interest in the next election, but to show how easily such an expectation might be thwarted he added very naively that he had not expected to have any personal interest in the last election, but that he accepted his position that he might not be disgraced by the loss of Indiana. But whether or no, he was in future coming back oftener to Massachusetts, and hoped to come back after the next presidential election and bring with him the banner to the Bay State Club, and have them tell him that "Massachusetts meets Indiana, and grasps her by the hand, and takes from her the banner that represents the Democracy of the same opinion for the purpose of reform in the public service," — with no other allusion to his chief, direct or indirect.

Why he left this extraordinary sort of banner at home on his present travels, and brought only his own trumpet with him, Mr. Hendricks did not explain. But in the absence of this banner Mr. Hendricks held himself out for the nonce as the Volunteer leader of the Hickory Broom Democracy, involving the notion of a clean sweep on true Jacksonian principles. What wonder that in the Bay State Club there should have been a number of voices to exclaim at his modest disclaimer of any personal interest in the next election, "Doubt it," "Head of the ticket next time." The object of the disclaimer was thus attained, and Mr. Hendricks may be considered as the unanimous nominee of all the Hickory Broomites in the Bay State Club. But if a candidate for the presidency should become amenable to the civil service examination, it will be necessary for Mr. Hendricks to brush up his geographical studies, for from his reported speech on this occasion it is evident that he is under the impression that New Haven and Yale College are in Massachusetts. But this was after dinner.

General Logan seems to be in the same box with Mr. Hendricks. Like Mr. Hendricks he was disinclined to take a sec-

ond place on the ticket in 1884, and is entirely opposed to running the old ticket in 1888. We are told that the formation of Blaine and Logan clubs in Ohio and elsewhere is extremely distasteful to the general. He considers that he made a great sacrifice when he consented to lend the party the use of his august name in a subordinate capacity to "strengthen the ticket." He did not wish to be disgraced, however, by having the party defeated in consequence of his refusing the place; so like Mr. Hendricks he condescended, but gives out that this is the very last time he will play second fiddle to anybody. His motto now is *aut Cæsar aut Nihil*. So he too must come to Massachusetts for a start, and accepted the invitation of the Norfolk County Club to a "banquet" at the Parker House, with the view of explaining his position.

At this "banquet" the sachems and braves of the Republican party proper of the vicinage were present; some two hundred of them, just about the same number and mostly of the same crowd that gathered about Mr. Blaine at the "banquet" at the Brunswick the evening before the last election. There were Governor Robinson, of course, and Senator Hoar, and A. W. Beard, and Henry Cabot Lodge, and Lieutenant Governor Ames, at both gatherings, in the places of honor. Let us recall a few incidents of those days and of the first feast. Senator Hoar was then fresh from Pittsfield, where he had made a great speech, in which he talked about a great many things and persons without alluding to Blaine. The audience became impatient, for they wanted to hear what their "pious and patriotic" senator had to say in defense of his inculcated candidate. "Why don't you mention Blaine?" some one called out. Drawing up to his loftiest altitude, the eminent senator scornfully and indignantly replied: "My friend will have an opportunity to hear his name many times during the next eight years. His name will be appended to many proclamations and to many bills sent to him by Congress!" When the senator soon after met the man of his idolatry at Worcester, "almost leaning upon him," as the papers told us, he said that "the hand of the pious and patriotic in the land was resting in benediction on Mr. Blaine's head." He took to prophesying again, and looked forward to a "lofty, serious, noble" administration of the presidency from the man on whose head the American people had

“showered the love and honor” of the campaign. Prediction and panegyric being thus exhausted by his efforts at Pittsfield and Worcester, the senator said nothing at the Brunswick “banquet,” but left the management of that to his brother Ebenezer and Mr. Lodge. And even as the senator leaned on Blaine at Worcester, so Blaine entered the Brunswick “banquet” hall, “leaning on the arm of Henry Cabot Lodge.” But alas for the short memory of politicians! After all the leaning on each other, all the embracing, all the affectionate interlocking of arms in this “pious and patriotic” crowd at the Brunswick in the fall of 1884, who could have anticipated such an ostentatious display of *very* cold shoulders to Mr. Blaine at Parker’s in the heated term of 1885? Logan, Long, and Lodge speechifying by the hour at a Republican “banquet,” and not one of them with one word to say for Blaine any more than for Dr. Burdard — caring as little, to all seeming, for the luminary as for the extinguisher. Here was an opportunity such as Senator Hoar promised his Pittsfield friend, preëminently one of the “many times” when Blaine’s name was to be heard over the land; but alas, “Morality dumb too!” Dumb as an oyster. His conscience perhaps asked him, “Why don’t you mention Blaine?” But he eased his mind by applying some frisky verses to his friend Cox, while there was ringing in his ears all the time a stanza much more *apropos* to the occasion:

“Oh, no! I *never* mention him,
His name is *never* heard;
My lips are now forbade to breathe
That once familiar word!”

And yet Senator Hoar had committed himself to Blaine for *two* terms; he was content with nothing short of *eight* years of signing bills and proclamations! Turning from Blaine now, he says “the king is dead.” Turning to Logan, “Long live the king who shall be!” It might have been too much to expect of the Middlesex Club, that at the banquet to Mr. Evarts they should have invited Mr. Blaine to break bread with his distinguished panegyrist. It was perhaps an oversight, or Mr. Blaine was not within reach. But for the Norfolk Club *not* to invite him to meet his eminent brother Republican and late associate on the presidential ticket can only be interpreted as a formal notice to quit. Mr. Blaine was at Augusta, or Bar Harbor

possibly, and could have been at Parker's at very short notice. He had been there before to meet Fisher on the Spencer-rifle business, and knew the way. But Mr. Blaine would have had something to say, and something to the purpose, curt and apposite, that would have contrasted too sharply with Logan's scattering platitudes. Logan laid out to bag everything. He was after the "literary fellers," and the colored race, and the white laborers, and the pilgrims, and the Hoar family, and the reformers, and the Republican party, and the educationists, and the protectionists, and free schools, and free speech, and free ballot; with the view of demonstrating that to secure all these things and make all these people happy it was necessary and proper to place the country and the constitution in the keeping of General Logan. In this multifarious harangue he spoke about "all things and some others"—except the thing that was uppermost in his mind, the New Ticket.

It seems that General Logan was at least an accessory to another snub at poor Mr. Blaine. We all remember (if we have not merely a politician's memory) the reception given to Mr. Blaine at the reunion of the Grand Army of the Republic at Old Orchard in Maine only one year ago. What an attraction he was to the occasion! No fewer than fifteen thousand people gathered there to see him. The Grand Army men gave him a guard of honor to escort him in his passage from the hall to the tavern, followed by a crowd crazy to have a look at the next President and to shake hands with him. By alternate use of his right and left hands the victim of this intoxicating homage was able to get through with only a tithe of the worshippers who craved this honor, before he was summoned to dinner, and thence, preceded by a brass band discoursing appropriate music, to the grove where the Grand Army of Maine and an immense concourse of spectators greeted him with enthusiastic shouts. He addressed the multitude with his usual aptness of speech, and dwelt particularly on the fact that under the "sheltering folds" of the flag of the Union we should all dwell together in unity, for the affecting and affectionate reason that "we are all brethren," even the brigadiers!

And what do we see in 1885 at the reunion of the same Grand Army of the Republic? Mr. Blaine received no invitation to be present. There was no room for him under the

“sheltering folds” of the flag — no “Hail to the Chief” for him in the music of the brass band. The Republican members of the committee on invitations did not think it would be “in line with the traditions and practices” of the Grand Army to ask Mr. Blaine. We are told that General Logan himself was of the same opinion. General Logan took the ground that the Grand Army cannot give invitations to civilians to attend their reunions unless they hold high official positions. It seems that only very choice specimens of the upper ten thousand are good enough to be invited to these aristocratic reunions, and even Mr. Blaine did not quite come up to the mark this year, though an official position in expectancy was sufficient in 1884. I must say that General Logan should have strained a point in favor of Mr. Blaine — considering.

It may be apprehended that these Republican gentlemen are losing sight of the fact that they have to deal with a man who is a very much smarter politician than any of them. They cannot afford to ignore Mr. Blaine. If they fail to invite him to their banquets, and to allude kindly to him in their speeches, he can find ready access to the people through other channels than the Norfolk Club or the Middlesex Club. Even his ghost would be a hard thing to lay, but while he remains in the flesh it is of little use for “pious and patriotic” Republicans to make believe they think he is dead.

It is curious enough that both the Vice-Presidents, elect and non elect, should be in open revolt against their chief. The course of Mr. Hendricks's Postmaster Jones at Indianapolis seems specially designed to precipitate a quarrel on the civil service policy of the administration. Logan, too, must have his fling at the President on this score, though we have not heard that the administration has interfered with the numerous brothers, sister, and brothers-in-law, cousins, nephews, nieces, son and sons-in-law, and other dependents that General Logan deemed it a family duty to provide for at the public crib. I will volunteer a suggestion for the benefit of these self-asserting candidates. There have always been one or two engrossing questions that have governed presidential elections. Gratitude for their military services was the mainspring of the elections of Washington and Grant, and sustained them through their administrations. The fate of John Adams was determined by

the alien and sedition laws, and the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798. Without going into detail, the embargo, the war with England, strict and latitudinarian construction of the Constitution in the matter of the tariff and of internal improvement (to say nothing of lighthouses of the sky), justice to General Jackson, the Bank of the United States, the sub-treasury, the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico, the northwestern boundary, the compromise measures, free soil, abolition, the rebellion and the quelling of it, the tariff and the brigadiers on one side and the personality of the candidates on the other, with reference to a pure administration, — all these questions at different times, and only one or two of them at any particular time, have served as the shibboleths of party and determined the results of national elections. On the one great issue that now occupies the public mind President Cleveland has got the inside track. Circumstances have made him the representative of civil service reform. It has been committed to him — the task of uprooting the great evil of our times, the infamous doctrine that the offices of the country are the spoils of the victors, belonging of right to certain elected office-holders, to be distributed at their dictation among their scouts, henchmen, lackeys, and strikers for the personal service they have rendered to their respective chiefs. The more that Logan and Hendricks agitate this question, in whatever aspect, the more they strengthen President Cleveland with the people. For the people, in their separate, peaceful, and friendly communities, have no desire to see them made into into miniature hells for the benefit of the head devils of greedy factions. Civil service reform is the sheet anchor of the administration, and will hold the ship of state to its moorings in spite of the storms with which it is bound to be assailed.

Several interesting questions have arisen since the inauguration of President Cleveland, notably in the navy department, and Mr. Whitney has won golden opinions in all quarters for the intelligence and promptitude with which he has dealt with the Dolphin and Mr. Roach. The only mistake he has made was in consulting the attorney-general. The public mind of the North is disturbed by the idea of repudiating contracts of the government on any ground, but particularly on the ground that they are avoided by any act of omission or commission of

the official agent of the government. Mr. Garland's legal opinion upon any subject will be exposed to severe criticism, but no opinion of his advising the repudiation of contracts can ever be accepted as of the slightest value. The legislature of Arkansas, that in 1883 proposed an amendment to their Constitution repudiating some thirteen millions of the bonds of that State, reëlected Mr. Garland as a member of the United States Senate. It is to be presumed that Mr. Garland's views on repudiation were in accord with those of the legislature which reëlected him. In our section of the country we regard a man who does not pay his debts as a dishonest man, in whom we can place no confidence. We look upon men who repudiate the debts of a town, county, or state, in precisely the same light. They are in the popular judgment dishonest and dishonored. Mr. Garland, therefore, as a repudiator must always be an incubus on the administration — a very heavy load for Mr. Cleveland to carry. But this is too large a subject to be discussed incidentally in a closing paragraph.

I shall have an opportunity of considering it more at length when commenting in a subsequent chapter on the doings of the two recent Conventions in Virginia.

August 1, 1885.

XVII.

BLAINE'S SKIRMISH LINE OF 1888.

*The Empire State. — Repudiating Populations and the Democrats.
— The Old Dominion.*

ON the skirmish line of 1888, as he styles it, Mr. Blaine comes to the front again. In a recent interview, invited for the occasion, he insisted that Mr. Evarts is the most desirable person for the Republicans to nominate as their candidate for the governorship of New York at the approaching election. It is fair to give Mr. Blaine credit for political sagacity, and I think he shows it in this suggestion. If Mr. Evarts should run and be elected, it puts New York in the Republican line again for the next presidential contest. If he should run and fail, then

he would be extinguished as an aspirant, and resume his old position as *aide* on the staff of Blaine, commander-in-chief. Either way Mr. Blaine could not help making something quite worth his while.

In this matter I think it safe to say ditto to Mr. Blaine. It cannot be denied that Mr. Evarts developed a good deal of popular strength in his canvass for the senatorship. The objection that he is not a practical politician I consider quite a feather in his cap. By a practical politician is understood a man who stocks the primaries, packs the conventions, manipulates the address and resolutions, slips in the right officers and committees, signs recommendations for office, gets government jobs for his friends, and knows where to pick up the money for the boys to spend at election times. Mr. Evarts is no such man. And yet he showed himself somewhat practical when the Republican leaders in the legislature were laying pipe for the election of Levi P. Morton to the Senate of the United States. Mr. Evarts made it known that he was desirous of serving in that venerable body, and the voices that were raised in his behalf from all parts of the State were heard at Albany, and compelled the reluctant and recalcitrant politicians to elect him to the office he coveted, and is so well fitted to adorn. The practical politicians say that in view of the loss of Federal patronage the Republicans must nominate for governor some practical person who will come down with the dust handsomely, and who knows how to pass round the hat in Wall Street, and bring it back well filled with the yellow boys. They know who that man is, and it is not Evarts. When Evarts brings in his hat, there is nothing in it but brains, and that won't answer.

No, — for once I must agree with Mr. Blaine. I admit that Mr. Blaine's recommendation is rather a drawback. But give him Blaine's twelve hundred clergymen, and Henry Ward Beecher of twelve hundred parson power, to boot, and I think Evarts would stand a better chance of election than any Money Bags the Republicans could bring into the field.

But my present business is with other Republican friends of Mr. Blaine, and more particularly with the gentleman to whom he gave a certificate of pedigree and gentility two or three weeks ago, Mr. Wise. I had the pleasure of knowing this gentleman's father at the time when he was so distinguished

for the persistence and ability with which, on the floor of the House of Representatives, he denounced executive usurpation and corruption. He was a favorite with the Whig young men of the country, and if he had not strayed from the lines to become one of the corporal's guard of John Tyler, there was nothing in the gift of the party to which he might not have reasonably aspired. At a considerably later period I became much better acquainted with Mr. John Sergeant of Philadelphia, grandfather of the Mr. Wise who bears his name. I well remember his mild and unassuming manners, his pleasant and instructive conversation, and the high esteem in which he was held by men of all parties for his political consistency, professional ability, and personal honor. It is clear that as a gubernatorial candidate, Mr. Wise has exhibited mental and moral traits that never could have descended to him in the maternal line. And if the paternal Wise could revisit the "glimpses of the moon" and catch his son in such company as that which he keeps with Mahone and Riddleberger, he would be "making night hideous," for him, with a witness, and the day likewise.

The connecting link between Mr. Evarts and Mr. Wise is the patronizing approval of the Republican leader — for such I must still consider Mr. Blaine, when I hear the sympathizing responses of Senator Hoar and John Sherman to the passionate outcry of the defeated chieftain at Augusta. If Mr. Evarts should receive the Republican nomination in New York, the canvass in that State will be an interesting one, and I may have a few words to say about it. Meanwhile I have something more to say of the fight in the Old Dominion.

It is no easy matter to evolve from the chaos and confusion of that contest an intelligible commentary on it. Each party stigmatizes the other as "Repudiators." From this we may infer that both parties consider the epithet a term of reproach. Readjusters flout their political enemies with the cry of "repudiators and assassins." The Funders return the compliment with the taunt of "thieves and repudiators." It is the proverbial interchange of amenities between the pot and the kettle, and as an abstract question we may well regard it in the philosophical spirit with which the good woman watched the scrimmage between the bear and her husband. It is a matter of indifference which whips.

But when we reflect seriously on the state of things in Virginia, it suggests a variety of issues, that are of great interest and importance to other States and all parties. Republican Federal administrations have disgraced themselves by their open patronage of Repudiation, whenever it promised to advance their interests by influencing votes. The Democratic party are now in possession of the Government. The change of a few hundred votes in the Northern States determined their success, and will be sufficient to compass their defeat. They are now brought face to face with the fact that almost all the so-called States that "went Democratic" are associations of repudiators. Populations that defraud their creditors can be styled "States" only by courtesy. Experimentally, and for a specific purpose, or as a choice of evils, honest men may be willing to intrust the government to a party whose main wing is composed of defaulters and Jeremy Diddlers, but are not likely to make a permanent association with them. If the Democratic party of Virginia, or of the South generally, have the remotest hope of reëstablishing the influence their fathers had in the government of the country (an influence which they owed to circumstances that do not now exist), if they indulge the flattering idea that they have come to stay, they will have to change their policy in regard to non-payment of their State debts. On this point they have become utterly demoralized. It was a Democratic State government that initiated repudiation in Alabama. It was the Democratic party that affixed this stigma upon Georgia. It was the Democratic party that run Arkansas and Tennessee into this abyss. The repudiators of Georgia and Arkansas are now represented in the cabinet by Lamar and Garland. I do not object to these gentlemen that they have been rebels. The right of secession or the right of nullification is all rotten nonsense. But the right of rebellion is another thing. It is an indefeasible right under circumstances that seem to make the exercise of it necessary, and of this necessity the rebel is the judge. The outcry about the "wickedness" of men, who had the same right to battle for the political dogmas they had been brought up in that we had to battle for putting them down, is unworthy of intelligent and honest men. Coming from partisans and candidates for popular suffrage like Sherman, Blaine, and Hoar, it provokes the obvious and well-founded retort that

if these gentlemen had lived in the South instead of the North they would have catered for the Southern vote and figured as the most rebellious of the rebels.

It is no longer a tenable objection to a man that he has been a rebel. We can welcome rebels into political fellowship and personal friendship. But to imagine that the honorable and debt-paying States of this Union propose to keep its great government in the hands of a knot of seedy and insolvent "sovereigns" who defraud their creditors and pass their time in evading executions and dodging the constable, is a vain and wicked imagination. There is no such thing in the books. No party can acquire more than an accidental and precarious ascendancy in this country that is largely encumbered with members who disavow the obligation of State contracts and refuse the honest payment of State debts. It was solely on issues of personal and political trustworthiness, as between Blaine and Cleveland, that the Republican party was defeated in the late presidential election. Questions of moral principle will enter into the next election as in the last, and it will be incumbent on the Democracy to bring their notions of pecuniary honesty into line with the advanced sentiments on the duties and responsibilities of rulers, that have acquired and secured for Mr. Cleveland the sincere coöperation of the Mugwumps.

The relations of the two parties in Virginia to the last decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the coupon question form an equally interesting feature of the canvass with the policy of readjustment or defalcation. When the decision was pronounced in the case of *Poindexter v. Greenhow*, enforcing the receivability of coupons for taxes, the Readjusters were represented as being in great excitement about it, and agreed that it gave Mahone his chance to regain what he had lost in Virginia. Mr. Wise was reported at that time to have said: "Mahone will this time lead his own forces. He will be nominated next month by a Republican convention for governor on a platform of the most aggressive character. Already a plan of action has been agreed upon, and the cry is to be that a packed court has made an unconstitutional decision. The State rights doctrine, dear to Virginia, has been trampled under foot, and resistance to it will be advocated by every means short of actual war." Mr. Wise further declared that he was pleased with the

decision, that it would lead to a very bitter fight, and that Mahone would carry with him a majority of the white people of Virginia, and that his majority would not be less than 20,000. Attention was to be drawn away from the negro question as far as possible, and the issue was to be the Riddleberger coupon-killer and Mahone to execute it.

Such was the programme of the Readjusters in April, and if we can believe the newspapers and the politicians, a state of things was revealed in the Old Dominion that fully justified it. From tide-water to the Blue Ridge, Virginia was agitated and convulsed. The entire colored population of Republican and non-paying proclivities was up in arms. All the robbers of hen roosts, all the sneak thieves, all the purloiners of jewelry in hotel bed-rooms, all the appropriators of overcoats in front halls, all the inmates of the penitentiaries, and all the candidates for punitive seclusion, were boiling over with a fiery and scarlet indignation. All the lineal descendants of the imported convicts of two centuries ago with long and loud imprecations were swearing perpetual fidelity to the memories and traditions of their fathers. Every grog-shop in Richmond, and every cross-road grocery in the State, teemed with crowds of thirsty patriots who were unanimously in favor of liberty or death. Mahone, Riddleberger, Wise, and Cameron were supposed to be scouring the country, carrying the fiery cross and the black flag, with frenzied outcries, and threats of vengeance against the bloated bondholders and the Supreme Court of the United States.

The right to defraud creditors was an inalienable right of sovereignty, and without it sovereignty was of no account.

But when the Republican convention met in July this excitement had subsided. By this time its members had reached the conclusion that Mahone would not answer as a candidate. The colored voters shook their heads and whispered that they wanted a gem'man. It was said to be the "proud boast" of Virginians that a gubernational candidate must be a gentleman; and poor Mahone did not come in that category. But Wise was a real gentleman. He could talk to the colored voters as no other man except one of their own number. He could interest the colored voters by throwing glass globes in the air and shattering them with an accuracy and dexterity of aim that

captivated all spectators. He could tell stories and sing songs in the negro dialect with a cleverness that would distinguish him as a "bright, particular" star in any company of negro minstrels in the country. He could make longer stump speeches and more of them than any other man in the State, without impairing his wind. He could turn a somersault quicker and oftener than one of Barnum's clowns, quicker and oftener than Mahone himself. Sambo in "Uncle Tom's Cabin" could not make a saucier retort or utter a sharper gibe. There was no end of his accomplishments in this way. And then as for non-payments, he could be relied on as the very repudiator of repudiators, every time. The Funders only pretended to be dishonest—they acquiesced in repudiation, but they did not believe in it; whereas he believed in it to the death. What greater proofs could he give than all these of being a gentleman? And then in what a gentlemanly way he afterwards spoke of his rival candidate. The nomination suited him exactly. Lee was the easiest man to beat. Lee would never have been heard of if he had not been the nephew of his uncle. Then as the culmination of abuse, the final and fatal objection, Lee had written a letter in 1877 advocating payment of the State debt, and this was something that would not go down in Virginia, and that would be hard to explain! Certainly, Wise's deportment, language, and principles are those of a perfect gentleman, and they have been improving prodigiously since he joined in the infamous conspiracy of Mahone to subjugate the Old Dominion by the adroit management of the negro voters. A South Carolina gentleman, who was traveling in Virginia during the canvass that resulted in the Readjuster victory, informs me that he attended numerous meetings of the Mahonites, and that everywhere the negroes were relied on as the most potent factor in the canvass. He heard the white orators telling them that the State was groaning under a heavy debt, and that the Democrats wanted to pay it. The orators explained to the colored voters that the State was a sovereign, and that sovereigns need not pay their debts unless they choose to do so; and that to pay money the State could not be compelled to pay was folly and ruination. Besides, this enormous debt was the White Men's debt. It had been entirely contracted before the war and while the colored men were slaves, and it was tyranny to tax them to pay a debt which

they had no voice or vote in creating. The Democrats intended to tax the colored men for the payment of this debt, and the colored men should vote for candidates who would repudiate the greater part of it, and make efficient arrangements not to pay the rest.

Mahone and his co-conspirators by arguments of this kind succeeded in convincing the negro voters, and boasted that they had them solid on the question of not paying. The meaner classes of white men chimed in with this style of argument, and from that time the course of the State has been downwards — downwards — till it has reached a plane where the contest between the parties turns on the most expedient methods of defrauding the creditors of the State, and the most ingenious devices for evading its legal responsibilities by nullifying the judgments of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The way in which this debt was contracted, and the way in which it has been repudiated, will furnish topics for subsequent chapters. This discussion may not be entertaining, but it has an important bearing on the relations of the paying and non-paying States to each other, to political parties, to the federal judiciary and the Democratic administration.

September 1, 1885.

XVIII.

THE VIRGINIA CANVASS.

The Creation of the Virginia Debt — Repudiation — Moses and Mahone.

FROM the preëminent influence which Virginia formerly exercised in public affairs, even her local elections, ever since I can remember anything of politics, have been watched with great interest in other States. The present canvass between Lee and Wise excites perhaps more than ordinary attention. For the first time in history the Federal administration has no finger in the pie. It leaves the citizens of the State to solve the question whether or not they propose to remain the vassals of Billy Mahone. From the ominous growls of the Republican bosses in the North, we are led to believe that they are not entirely satis-

fied with the practical working of the Fourteenth Amendment, and begin to entertain serious doubts of its wisdom, justice, and particularly of its policy. It looks very much as if they were contemplating an agitation for its repeal. This makes us anxious to ascertain if Wise can accomplish his brag of hurling a solid column of 120,000 colored voters against the party that has for nearly a century wielded the political power of the Old Dominion. About all this, as good old Mr. Ritchie was fond of writing, *nous verrons*. Now about Repudiation, and what led to it.

Fifty years ago Virginia had no means of marketing her agricultural products, except by hauling them in heavy and expensive wagons over roads that were almost impassable during the season when the farmers could apply themselves to this indispensable labor. It cost from a fifth to a third of the value of their crops to transport them to points where they could be sold. In the tobacco counties the methods were very primitive. The crop was packed in tight hogsheads, spikes were driven into both ends and attached to shafts, and in this way mules dragged them through muddy roads to remote markets. In all sections of the State, the travel of passengers was equally inconvenient and expensive.

This style of transportation and travel was anything but satisfactory to the planters, and the people in all quarters of the Commonwealth called clamorously on their legislature for improved methods, and for the investment of such money as they could raise on the public credit in the construction of better turnpikes, and in canals and railroads. Alexander H. H. Stuart, of Augusta County, then a young and able member of the House of Delegates, was notably the pioneer of this great work. His report on the subject—made as chairman of the committee to which it was referred—pointed out all the great lines of improvement which have since been constructed. The scheme was defeated at the time by a small majority, but a beginning was made in a small way by the construction of two macadamized roads, for one of which the State paid the entire cost from its not overflowing treasury.

The advantages resulting from these works were too marked and obvious not to be followed up, and in the twenty years ensuing, the universal sentiment of both the Whig and Democratic

parties was strongly enlisted in the prosecution of the system of internal improvements. Its results were so beneficial and profitable to the farmers and traveling community that in eastern Virginia not a voice was raised against the system, though the complaint was sometimes heard from the people west of the mountains that they were being taxed for enterprises of which their tide-water brethren were reaping the advantages. At all events, a system was created which largely increased the values of property all over the State, and the burthen of the taxation for payment of accruing interest was regarded as insignificant in view of the resulting benefits. Before the outbreak of the civil war and before the division of her domain, Virginia had issued her bonds for a large amount of money which she had safely and wisely invested in the classes of improvement below named :

For Railroads	\$18,584,928.28
Canals and Navigation Companies	12,234,116.30
Plank Road Companies	399,735.41
Turnpike Companies	2,371,009.10
Bridge Companies	104,471.66
State Roads	1,835,828.83
	<hr/>
	\$35,520,109.59

More than an hundred statutes were passed at different times to carry out the various parts of this system, so that the people of the State through their agents had the opportunity of expressing their will on almost every item comprising the ultimate indebtedness. There were never State obligations entered into more deliberately, with a more perfect understanding on the part of the constituency, or with a more universal assent. And never did State or individual get better money's worth than Virginia got for her expenditure in these works.

At the close of the civil war, the legislature at once addressed itself to the ascertainment of the precise extent of the indebtedness of Virginia, with the view of adjusting the portion of the liability equitably attaching to West Virginia. The entire debt of the old Commonwealth amounted on the first of January, 1867, to upwards of forty-three millions of dollars. The Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia decided that both Virginia and West Virginia were bound for the whole of this indebtedness. Virginia was willing to assume what she considered her fair proportion of it, which she estimated at two

thirds of the entire debt. Indeed West Virginia by the terms of the separation from the old Commonwealth agreed to assume one third of the debt at that time existing; but to this day we look in vain for any such assumption, or any movement contemplating the redemption of her promise.

It was not till the session of the legislature of 1870-71 that any important step was taken by Virginia towards the adjustment and funding of the State debt and making provision for its payment. Early in that session a resolution was introduced, authorizing the governor to tender to West Virginia a proposition for referring to arbitration the apportionment of the existing public debt to the respective States. During the discussion of this resolution not a word was uttered intimating repudiation. It passed the House of Delegates unanimously. It passed the Senate, thirty-five members being present, with only four dissenting voices, and received the signature of the governor. No sooner was this matter thus disposed of than a motion was made contemplating a "compromise" of the debt at fifty cents on the dollar. This was the first public suggestion of anything like repudiation, and it was disguised under the title of compromise. But even this mild approach to the objective point was frowned upon by the legislature, and an act was passed, by large majorities in both Houses, providing for the issue of new bonds to the amount of two thirds of the existing debt, and of deferred certificates for the other third; the latter to be provided for, principal and interest, in accordance with such final settlement as might be made with West Virginia.

Of these deferred certificates no notice has since been taken by either State, and we may here dismiss the consideration of this part of the transaction, as without any immediate bearing on our present purpose. The debt of West Virginia stands on peculiar grounds, which we need not now discuss. Virginia consummated a transaction with her creditors in pursuance of which they accepted with alacrity the new bonds, and the deferred certificates; a compromise free from the taint of repudiation, and one which her creditors were at liberty to accept or decline. To make it more agreeable to the creditors, the legislature pledged the State faith for the punctual payment of interests half-yearly on the new bonds, and as an additional guarantee of that payment contracted that the matured interest coupons

should be received in absolute payment of all taxes and dues to the Commonwealth. Notwithstanding the indefinite postponement of one third of the debt, no bondholder interposed any objection, and the funding process begun in July went on with great rapidity. In less than six months there had been funded in bonds and certificates upwards of twenty-eight millions of dollars.

This settlement is what is known in Virginia politics as the Funding Act. The party favoring it have since been assailed with the epithet of Funders. When all other disparaging names have failed to convey an adequate idea of a man's depravity, the repudiators cap the climax by describing the wicked person as a Funder; and by this they mean a person who at one time was so blind to the real sentiments of the people of Virginia as to imagine that they would acquiesce in the honest payment of their debts. Mr. Wise thinks this the crowning disqualification of Fitz-Hugh Lee. It is the unpardonable sin. But Mr. Lee says that he is no more in favor of paying than Mr. Wise is, if the Virginians prefer to defraud their creditors.

Notwithstanding the strong majority by which the Funding Act was passed in both houses, it became the subject of much passionate denunciation among the people, and furnished the topic of discussion in the canvass that followed for the election of members of the legislature. The Republican convention arraigned the Democrats for passing a bill that was at once unnecessary and oppressive. When the legislature met at Richmond in December, 1871, it was soon apparent that funding was not in favor. A joint resolution discontinuing the issue of bonds required to be issued by the Funding Act presently passed both houses almost by acclamation. It was vetoed by Governor Walker, and again passed, over the veto, by the requisite majority. The governor denounced the resolution as unjust, unwise, and destructive of all confidence in the integrity of the people, and the legislature still declared that they had no intention of repudiating the debt. They only insisted that until the exact amount that belonged to Virginia could be determined, Virginia ought not to pay anything. In view of the suspended debt and the treatment of it by the two Commonwealths, this postponement of the whole debt of Virginia till West Virginia consents to assume thirteen millions of it was equivalent to an adjournment *sine die*.

The effect of the legislation of 1872 was to suspend the operation of the Funding Act until new coupons could be printed in which the clause was stricken out that made them receivable in payment of all taxes, debts, and dues and demands of the State. The act imposing taxes for the year also provided for retaining out of all interest payable at the treasury on all State bonds "a tax equal in amount to fifty cents on the hundred dollars market value of the bonds from which such interest is derived." This led to a protest from the foreign bondholders, and to suits to test the constitutionality of such legislation.

The questions submitted to the Supreme Court of the State on the act of 1871 were in substance: 1. Whether that act created a valid contract of the State with such bondholders as accepted its terms, to receive the coupons for taxes; and 2. Whether the refusal to receive the coupons impaired the obligation of this contract. The Supreme Court of Virginia answered both questions in the affirmative. Judge Bouldin was of the opinion that the act of 1872 was repugnant to the Constitution of the State and to that of the United States, and that a temporary relief from pecuniary pressure would be too dearly bought at the price of the broken faith of Virginia. Judge Anderson and Judge Christian assented to the decision delivered by Judge Bouldin. There was one dissenting voice on the bench. Judge Staples did not believe that any legislature could bind succeeding legislatures in the manner contemplated by the Funding Act. He thought the questions involved of duty and obligation belonged to the legislature to decide, and observed, with amiable credulity, in the most inconsequent judicial dictum I remember to have met with: "Virginia's representatives will not fail to preserve untarnished Virginia's honor." In another recent case the Court had declared, Judge Christian delivering the opinion, "*The inviolability of contracts, public and private, is the foundation of all solid progress, and the corner stone of all the forms of civilized society,*"—words that ought to be written on tablets of stone and set up in all the legislative graveyards where the honor and good faith of repudiating sovereigns are buried.

In 1873 another step was taken in the direction of repudiation. The act providing for the payment of interest on the public debt cut down the money payments, and authorized the

issue of non-interest bearing certificates for the portion unpaid. "These amounts," the act says, are "all the Commonwealth is able to pay at this time." The Republican convention, one half of whose delegates were colored, adopted resolutions condemning all forms of repudiation—condemning the funding bill as unjust, impolitic, and oppressive, and enacted solely in the interest of bondholders—and demanding the submission of the questions touching the financial obligations of West Virginia to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Democrats, or Conservatives as they now called themselves, in their convention of the year said nothing on the subject, but they resolved unanimously that the honor, etc., of the State must rest on the virtue, etc., of the people. There they left honor and virtue for the present.

In pursuance of the mandates of a joint resolution of the legislature of 1874, a conference was held at Richmond in November of that year, between the governor and treasurer of the State and its bondholders, for the purpose of securing the respective rights and interests of the parties. Governor Kemper explained at the conference that the legislature of 1871 had injudiciously promised more than Virginia could perform, but averred that under the new tax laws the State would be able to pay four per cent. on the whole of the now funded debt, and *only* four per cent. under circumstances then existing. The result of this explanation was the unanimous adoption by the parties to the conference of resolutions setting forth that from accruing revenues the State ought to set apart the moneys requisite to pay four per cent. on her bonds, issue non-interest bearing certificates for the unpaid two per cent., and resume the full payment of six per cent. as soon as practicable. This transaction contemplated the surrender of the tax-receivable coupons as they fell due, and the payment of the two per cent. interest every half year. The treasurer of the State at this time was the much respected R. T. M. Hunter, a man of ability, experience in affairs, and unsullied personal honor. A negotiation conducted on the part of the State by that gentleman and the conservative Governor Kemper could not result in a discreditable arrangement.

During the administration of Governor Kemper sincere efforts were earnestly made to increase the revenues of the State, and to

make provision for the payment of accruing interest on the debt. The legislature in 1877 passed an important measure to this end in the Moffatt Register Law, the object of which was to impose and collect a tax on the privilege of selling wine, ardent spirits, malt or mixed liquors, and the revenue to be derived from that source was estimated at half a million of dollars, and if fairly collected this was a very moderate estimate for a thirsty people. The Democratic convention of the year adopted resolutions urging reduction in expenditures and return to the ancestral methods of economy and frugality. One of the resolutions rang with such words as the glorious history of Virginia, etc., proud of her name and fame, etc., scorn to repudiate, etc., preserve inviolate public faith and credit, etc., just and honorable, etc.; but this is ancient history, and the Democrats under Mahone's discipline have grown ashamed of it and disavow manfully all the intentions implied in these gorgeous parts of speech.

Negotiations formal and informal continued to go on between the State and its creditors; sundry propositions were introduced in the legislature that were reported on and came to nothing, till another Funding bill known as the M'Culloch bill, and entitled, "An Act to provide a settlement of the Public Debt," came in force on March 28, 1879. This Act contemplated no repudiation. It recognized the entire debt, but gave creditors the option to exchange their present securities for non-taxable bonds, with tax-receivable coupons or certificates, bearing interest of three per cent. for ten years, four per cent. for the next twenty, and five per cent. for the last ten years. Acceptance of certificates for West Virginia's third was to be taken as an absolute release of Virginia from any liability on account of such certificates. The bondholders did not hesitate to accept the terms offered by this Act, as within four months of its final passage, bonds and securities to the amount of twelve millions of dollars had been sent in for conversion. Within six months there had been actually funded at three per cent. \$7,944,314. If the two thirds of the joint debt had been thus refunded, Virginia would have been absolved from West Virginia's portion of it, and would have been liable to an annual interest of only \$936,812.

Favorable as this proposition was and insignificant as this

burden would have been on a taxable property of \$353,000,000, it did not suit the men who thought the proper thing was to reduce both principal and interest, as an entering wedge to the entire repudiation of both. An agitation was started, before the passage of this Act, for its repeal. It was a plain case for a combination of dishonest men of all parties to obtain political power by making common cause against the debt-payers. Men who were aiming by a fair agreement to cut down merely the interest on the debt stood no chance whatever in a contest with a gang of knaves who taught the people that they were not to be "dictated to" by their creditors, but that they should pay just as much of their debts as they had a mind to, and not a cent more, and if their creditors did not take that they should not get anything. That was the talk, and when the next legislature took their seats at Richmond, the debt-payers were nowhere, and Mahone and Riddleberger were on top.

The next chapter in this financial chronicle which now interests us is the repudiating bill of March, 1880, impudently entitled "an Act to reëstablish the public credit of the State." This bill proposed in effect to repudiate \$13,000,000 of the recognized State debt; to cut off one half of the interest payable on the residue, and make nearly all of the reduced interest on that residue dependent on the State, city, and county taxation. The Democratic governor, Holliday, returned this bill to the Senate; refusing to approve it on the ground that it violated the Constitution of the State and of the United States, and was repugnant to all the traditions which had given the Commonwealth of Virginia her high and honorable position among the States. In his message the governor dwelt upon the circumstances under which the debt was contracted, and the fact that \$34,000,000 of the money had been expended within the present borders of the State. He reminded the legislature that for the repayment of this money Virginia had pledged "the faith of the State to provide sufficient funds, and for that purpose to levy adequate taxes." He pointed out that the consideration of the debt still survives, and "increases manifold the values of property throughout the State," and that, without the means of transit and transportation this money had provided, great portions of Virginia would be to this day a waste. He recalled the fact that four times after the close of the civil war, the Gen-

eral Assembly of the State unanimously reaffirmed the validity of the obligation. The new Constitution admitted its sanctity. The first Assembly under that Constitution passed an act recognizing it in its entirety. The Assembly of 1877 at its second session (1878) passed an act in settlement, based on the consent of the creditors, which was regarded by the outside world as fair and honorable. And to this recapitulation of the facts showing the scandalous dishonesty of the bill vetoed, the governor added that if the law of 1877 had not been obstructed in its operation, it would have provided amply for the interest on the new bonds and soon have left a surplus in the treasury. Such was the opinion also of the father of the improvement system, the venerable A. H. H. Stuart, of Augusta County, who averred in his parting address to his constituents in 1877 that there was no difficulty whatever in meeting all the obligations of Virginia by an honest application of the revenue of the State to the objects for which it was pledged. Increase of taxation from fifty cents to sixty-six cents on the one hundred dollars would of itself accomplish the result. An increase of the capitation tax from one to two dollars for the support of the schools, and the passage of Governor Letcher's dog law, would in his judgment have solved all the financial difficulties of the State without any increase of the personal or real taxes.

The message of Governor Holliday had the ring of sterling metal in it. The time had come, however, which JOHN MARSHALL looked forward to nearly a hundred years before, but which never actually arrived till the days of Mahone and Riddleberger. "Seriously," wrote the typical Virginian in 1792 to his friend Archibald Stuart, — "seriously, there appears to me every day to be more damned rascality in the world than there was the day before; and I do verily begin to think that plain, downright honesty and unintriguing integrity will be kicked out of doors." "Damned rascality" is perhaps not a judicial phrase, but we might look through a "Webster Unabridged" from A to Izzard, without finding two other words that would cover the present case so completely. On this point I should have liked to take the judgment of two other great Virginians who died when the Old Dominion was at the meridian of its honorable fame, John Taylor of Caroline and John Randolph of Roanoke. What would those men have said to the individual

whom his admirers describe as the earliest and ablest apostle of Repudiation!

When repudiation of State indebtedness was adopted as the basis of party organization and action, no more fit representative of the "damned rascality" could be found for Virginia in the United States Senate than William Mahone. This is the individual to whom the friends of Mr. Blaine sometime caressingly alluded during the late presidential canvass as the "little Napoleon of Readjustment." For Mahone's vote in the Senate and for the remote chance of securing the vote of Virginia for the Republican candidate for the presidency, the Republican administration condoned Mahone's infamous policy on the State debt questions, and lent its official and efficient aid in demoralizing and humiliating a great commonwealth. This was a severe blow at the prestige of the Republican party. It had suffered somewhat from the juggling of the visiting statesmen with the Louisiana returning board. It had been still more impaired by the prompt and general compensation of these gentlemen, according to their service and standing, with offices of graduated importance, from a place in the custom-house to a foreign mission or a seat in the Cabinet. Oakes Ames's memorandum book made fearful havoc with the reputations of many formidable partisans. Garfield's peccadilloes were not without a damaging effect, in view of the persistent denial of them by himself and his party friends. The arbitrary and unlawful assessment of the Federal office-holders by Republican leaders shook the allegiance of many of the rank and file of the party; and the contemptuous treatment of all suggestions for the reform of the civil service alienated a still larger number from the Republican fold. So it was with the nomination of Mr. Blaine for the presidency, after the complete exposure of his corrupt methods and his chronic mendacity. All these things had very seriously impaired the reputation of the good old party and its hold on the popular regard. But no one of them had operated more distinctly to destroy all its supposed ethical claims to the support of our "best men," and to make those claims ridiculous, than its alliance with Mahone, and his investiture with all Federal patronage and influence within the borders of Virginia. It was only by the license and with the assistance of the Federal administration that Mahone was enabled to consum-

mate the colossal swindle by which he has placed Virginia outside the pale of civilized states, and reduced her to the financial level of a predatory Arab tribe or a community of Algerine pirates.

Well may ex-Governor Moses speculate on the ironies of Fortune in his solitary cell. "Alas," I hear him say, "how different might have been my fate if I had operated on a different arena! I procured by oblique methods an honest advance from my friend Mr. Higginson; my intentions were misconstrued — it was only a matter of a few dollars and quite within my means of ultimate repayment. The austere authorities of Massachusetts have consigned me to the penitentiary, regardless of my family, my high position, and my national reputation! But where, oh, where are Riddleberger and Mahone? They have engineered a swindle to the tune of thirteen millions of dollars, and instead of a term in the penitentiary they have got a term in the Senate of the United States. Why am not I in the Senate, and why are not they in the penitentiary?"

It would be hard to tell. Compared with the United States senators from Virginia, MOSES in the penitentiary may well pose as a MARCELLUS in exile.

September 10, 1885.

XIX.

REPUDIATION IN VIRGINIA.

How it reads in History. — Mahone, Riddleberger, and Wise. — The Fourteenth Amendment hardly an Unmixed Blessing.

It was not without being aware that the narrative was somewhat complicated and tedious that I gave in my last chapter a summary of the circumstances under which the public debt of Virginia was contracted, and of the methods in which it has been handled since the passage of the Funding Act of 1871. But the subject is important and in many points of view interesting to politicians, and in these days we are all measurably politicians, whether in petticoats or pantaloons.

I have before made passing reference to the legislation of 1879, which resulted in a second Funding Bill contemplating an agreement to recognize the principal of the public debt, and to scale the interest for a term of years. This was regarded as a triumph of the debt-payers, and it was in no sense discreditable. Indeed, Virginia received much praise from her neighbors for her comparative honesty. A Baltimore financial circular was quite gushing on the subject, comparing her conduct favorably with the action of Tennessee, North Carolina, and Louisiana, and congratulating her people because they had upheld the honor of their State, and had not sought to "*take advantage of their sovereignty to defraud their creditors.*" Soon after the same circular announced that the opponents of the bill were electioneering for its repeal; and it advised the bondholders to avail themselves of its provisions seasonably, for the repeal was just possible and delays were dangerous. The bondholders saw the point and were not slow in taking the hint; by the month of August about \$12,000,000 of consols, peelers [unfunded] and old bonds had been sent in for conversion. The bonds indeed came in so rapidly that the State auditor was compelled to suspend the receipt of them till he could dispose of the accumulation. The holders, feeling that half a loaf was better than no bread, governed themselves accordingly. And they moved none too soon, for the Readjusters carried the day, Mahone and Riddleberger were in the ascendant, and early in 1880 the General Assembly passed the Riddleberger bill which Governor Holliday vetoed. In view of the opposition to the Funding Bill known as the McCulloch act, and the fact that a majority of the General Assembly were in favor of abrogating its provisions, funding under it had ceased before the act was repealed by legislation.

During the year 1881 the debt question remained open, and was the subject of no end of resolving on the part of the several political conventions. It was the only material issue before the people that figured in the crystallization of parties. The convention of the Readjusters reasserted their purpose to settle the State debt on the principles of the vetoed Riddleberger bill, which distinctly repudiated \$13,000,000 of indebtedness. Men of this class John Marshall would have recognized as the "damned rascals" proper or special. The Republicans were

divided. One wing of this party was disposed to enter at once into full communion with the Readjusters on their own terms, and hold no Republican convention. The other wing were not quite prepared to take up their quarters with "the devil and his angels" and compromised on a sort of purgatory, in which they called each other "Straight-Outs." After some conferences of the wire-pullers, however, the two wings determined to meet in convention. When they met, to avoid possible unpleasantness, they agreed to disagree and filed into separate halls. The result was that one party resolved that they would vote for the Readjuster nominees, but that they would not abate one jot or tittle of their determination to pay to the last cent everything that Virginia owed. The Straight-Outs resolved to make separate nominations and adopted the most stringent resolutions, "pledging" in the "most solemn form" the Republican party of the State to the full payment of the whole debt of the State, less the one third set aside as justly belonging to West Virginia. They made their independent nominations. The nominees would not interfere with Readjuster success, and were promptly got out of the way to give a clear coast to Mahone, Riddleberger — and Satan.

It should be told to the credit of the colored voters that many of them were unwilling to train in such company. They held a convention at Petersburg, in which a considerable number of delegates resolved that they would have nothing to do with the Repudiators, entered their protest against the disgraceful coalition, withdrew in a body, and issued an address to the people. It was no wonder that honest and respectable colored persons should be unwilling to mix themselves up in such an enterprise.

The Democratic or Conservative convention adopted unanimously a resolution in which they "condemned repudiation [by Virginia] in every shape and form as a blot upon her honor, a blow to her permanent welfare, and an obstacle to her progress, in wealth, influence and power." They pledged themselves further to use every effort to secure an honest settlement of the debt, with the assent of the creditors, on the basis of a three per cent. bond. They were as far from assenting to forcible adjustment or repudiation as ever.

The election of the year resulted in the formation of a Readjuster Executive government and of a Readjuster majority in

both branches of the General Assembly. The Court of Appeals was reconstructed by the legislature by the appointment of five Readjuster judges. The Riddleberger bill, repudiating nearly one half of the public debt of the State, was passed by a large majority; and two other bills known as the Coupon Killers round off the nefarious history.

What was once a great Commonwealth — what is now a Commonwealth with \$352,000,000 of taxable property — sacrificed her credit and her honor for a money consideration so absolutely insignificant to each individual tax-payer that it would hardly seem a sufficient inducement for dishonesty to the inmates of a poor-house.

Thus we see, however, that more than ten years of hard work was necessary to sink the people of Virginia to the level of repudiation. It is stated in the Republican platform of the present canvass that the Conservatives have been in the habit of styling the men engaged in this business “repudiators and thieves,” and of denouncing readjustment as “the work of ignorant negroes and mean whites.” As a stranger, I do not know that I should think it becoming to use such language, but Virginians may be allowed to speak of each other as they please. As far as the epithets go, perhaps I should not much object to the downrightness of the Conservatives in calling a spade a spade. With regard to the averments of fact, I can only say that a patient attempt to learn the truth leaves me no reason to doubt that readjustment is really the work of the two classes to which the Democrats ascribe it. If I can credit Mr. Wise, he expects to carry the State by a solidarity of the colored vote, with an auxiliary force of white men who are real believers in the policy, the justice and the gentleship of breaking the commandment which strikes at the root of repudiation. Such men can be nothing but mean, whether black or white; none the less so certainly for being white.

While Blaine, Sherman, and Hoar are howling through the country their anathemas against the practical working of the Fourteenth Amendment, can they suppose that under the circumstances stated the intelligent and honest voters of Virginia can regard it as an unmixed blessing?

September 21, 1885.

X

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 785 873 3 •